

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN recent years we have received and commented on many books written by Jewish scholars resident in America; but, valuable and stimulating as most of them have been, it has seldom, if ever, been our good fortune to receive a book of such continuously absorbing interest as Dr. K. KOHLER's *Studies, Addresses, and Personal Papers* (Bloch Publishing Co.; \$4.00). It is a book of six hundred large pages, but there is not a dull line in it, and the themes treated are of astonishing variety. Wide and accurate scholarship here goes hand in hand with a lucidity and vigour which invest the treatment with a thoroughly popular interest.

There are, of course, subjects which will specially appeal to Jews—discussions of the Halakik Portions in Josephus' *Antiquities*, Shema' Israel, Maimonides and Rashi, Moses Mendelssohn, Zunz, etc., besides appreciations of modern Jewish scholars. But there is a large preponderance of subjects which cannot fail to interest educated men, and especially educated Christians, everywhere. Here are some of them: Jewish Wit and Humour, Jewish Superstition, Jewish Ethics, Human Brotherhood, Hellenism and Judaism, the Bible and Capital Punishment, the Synagogue and the Church in their Mutual Relations, Assyriology and the Bible, and many more of equal interest.

A chapter to which Christian scholars will very naturally turn is that on 'The Attitude of Chris-

tian Scholars to Jewish Literature,' and here a castigation is meted out to those scholars which doubtless many of them deserve. It is the one essay, however, in which at one point the writer's customary fairness seems to have deserted him. 'A Christian layman,' he tells us, 'occasionally ascertains the Jewish view regarding the origin of Christianity; a Christian theologian never, and he is probably right or wise in doing so.' This is surely an extreme statement. Just as there are Jewish scholars, like Mr. C. G. Montefiore and Dr. KOHLER himself, whose love of truth impels them to face and welcome all the facts, however disconcerting they may be to traditional prejudices, so there are Christian scholars inspired by exactly the same spirit. We willingly admit, however, that most of them need Dr. KOHLER's reminder that 'New Testament Exegesis will never attain a truly scientific character unless Rabbinical literature is thoroughly studied and consulted.'

One of the most fascinating features of the book is the attitude to Jesus and Christianity which gleams through the discussions at several points, and in one or two chapters is explicitly set forth. That attitude, while not indiscriminating, is uniformly generous. Even to Muhammadanism Dr. KOHLER is not unfriendly. The Jew has a mission, which enables him to be a mediator, so that Christianity and Islam can actually be regarded as 'help-mates and co-workers' in spreading the knowledge of the one true God; while, apart

altogether from his religious mission, he mediated Arabic culture, especially philosophy and science, to Christian Europe.

Naturally KOHLER, as a Jew, cannot accept the Church's attitude to Jesus. Jewish belief cannot tolerate the idea of a 'man-God,' or place on the throne of God any one born of woman. But that apart, no Christian could speak of Jesus with more devout appreciation of His personality than does KOHLER. While emphasizing the debt of Jesus to the Synagogue, he yet describes Him in these exalted terms. He was 'the noblest and most lofty-minded of all the teachers of Israel . . . the very ideal of greatness and tenderness, yet still a man and a brother, in heavenly lustre shining like the sun . . . the helper of the poor, the friend of the sinner, the brother of every fellow-sufferer, the comforter of every sorrow-laden, the healer of the sick, the uplifter of the fallen, the lover of man, and the redeemer of woman.'

KOHLER extends his generosity even to the Church. Synagogue and Church, he tells us, represent but different prismatic lines and shades, refractions of the same Divine light of Truth, opposite polar currents of the same magnetic power of love. They supplement and complete one another, while fulfilling the great providential mission of building up the kingdom of truth and righteousness on earth. 'It cannot and ought not to be denied that the ideal of human life held up by the Church is of matchless grandeur. Behind all the dogmatic and mystic cobwebs of theology there is the fascinating model of human kindness and love, a sweeter and loftier one than which was never presented to the veneration of man.' To a Jew who is willing to look with eyes so frank at the excellence of the Church, the Christian is bound to give heed when he states with equal candour what he regards as 'radical defects' of her system, which, in his judgment, are these: too much is made to depend upon the Creed and upon the renunciations explicit or implicit in the Sermon on the Mount, and it 'turns the gaze too exclusively to the life beyond the grave.' Doubtless the Christian could meet these criticisms satisfactorily: still, it is good to

see ourselves as others see us, especially when those others are competent, earnest, and friendly representatives of another great religious system.

By no means the least interesting feature of the book is its exposition of Reform Judaism. KOHLER's earlier years were spent in an environment of Neo-orthodoxy—a fact which gives all the more piquancy to his eloquent and trenchant championship of Reform. No Christian could speak more sharply of 'the vagaries of Talmud, Midrash, and Cabbala,' of 'the dusty arena of the Halakah,' and the 'mass of worthless sayings,' among which is embedded here and there a gem. The narrow life of the Ghetto to which the Jews were constrained by their Christian persecutors explains much of this concentration upon fruitless minutiae, and in one sense these were even fruitful, in so far as they protected the Jew from his environment; but to-day, KOHLER argues, Judaism must drop its Orientalisms, abandon the 'thousands of minute statutes and restrictions' in which it has been petrified, learn to relate itself to the world of modern civilization, and realize that its real contribution to the welfare of humanity is its emphasis upon the ethical and humanitarian, not the ritual, aspect of religion.

In all this one hears an echo of the ancient struggle between the prophet and the priest, and KOHLER's sympathies are unequivocally with the prophet. It is one of many proofs of his fair-mindedness that he is not blind to the shortcomings of Reform; he finds in some aspects of it a tendency to the neglect of domestic devotion and the substitution of reason for sentiment. But he insists that in spirit and in form Judaism must adapt itself to Western civilization. Orthodoxy has neither the power nor the ambition to do this; but Reform, by emphasizing the broadly human aspects of the Jewish tradition, can effect this accommodation, and thus it is seen to be essentially cosmopolitan; for the beginning and the end of Judaism is 'religion humanized and humanity religionized.'

And this suggests another equally interesting and closely connected feature of the book, namely, the



writer's attitude to Zionism. Here, as everywhere, he is engagingly frank. He describes himself as a determined opponent of the Zionist movement ever since it began. It is a wholly erroneous idea, he says, that the Jews living in the various countries of Western civilization still look to Palestine as their home—a sentiment refuted and resented by every Jewish citizen in England or America, France or Germany. These Jews do not regard themselves as aliens and strangers in the land in which they live: they are loyal citizens, and they have no ambition whatever to found a Jewish State.

---

'We love Jerusalem as the cradle of our national existence, but we do not long for a return.' At best those who would return would be those whose lives had been made bitter by tyranny in the land of their birth: the wealthy and the more gifted would be little likely to join the procession to Palestine with the intention of making it their permanent home. Reform Judaism would indeed not only not discourage, it would heartily endorse the colonization of Palestine by Jews, just as it would encourage the colonization of any other land for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of Eastern sufferers, and offering relief to the congested Jewish quarters in the old world or in the new. But that is very far from being synonymous with Zionism.

---

To Zionism KOHLER is resolutely opposed, because he is convinced that Judaism is an historical mission, not a national life. Its function in the world is not to be a political power, but to work as a cosmopolitan factor of humanity, standing for the double truth that God is One and man is one. It is not the resuscitation of the material Zion in which the Reform Jew is interested, but 'the ideal Zion not built by human hands, the spiritual Zion for all mankind.'

---

The learning, the insight, the eloquence, the charity, the broad-mindedness of these various discussions is worthy of all praise. The writer died on January 28, 1926, but from this massive volume he will long speak words of wisdom and generosity not only to his fellow-Jews, but to those

whom we believe he would, in some real sense, have been willing to call his fellow-Christians.

---

In reading the late Dr. Benjamin B. WARFIELD'S *Studies in Perfectionism*, we were struck by the fact that his criticism of Albrecht Ritschl's system of theology is essentially similar to that which we have learned to expect from the leaders of the Barthian movement. No doubt Dr. WARFIELD and the Barthians show a common adherence to the Pauline-Augustinian-Evangelical theology of sin and grace, but otherwise they have little in common. In matters of Biblical criticism they are poles apart, nor in philosophy is there between them any true meeting-ground.

---

Dr. WARFIELD'S general objection to the Ritschlian theology is that it is subjective or naturalistic. That is why it lays all the stress on the activities of the Christian life. There is nothing else on which it could lay its stress. What man himself does, the influences by which he is brought to do it, and the issue of his activities—this, as he says, is the circle of topics in which what, by a strange transmutation of meaning, is still called Theology, moves. Ritschl continues to employ the terms reconciliation, justification, forgiveness, adoption, regeneration, sanctification; but they one and all denote in his hands human, not Divine, acts.

---

With the justness of this criticism we are not here concerned, but we are reminded by it of the Barthian reaction from that subjectivism or naturalism in theology which derives from Schleiermacher and is in large measure (if not in so large a measure as Dr. WARFIELD thinks) perpetuated in Ritschl. The Barthians recall us to the theocentric standpoint of the Protestant Reformation. They would remind us that theology is not theistic philosophy. In Christianity it is God who speaks and man who listens, and the function of Christian theology is to hear and expound God's authentic Word, not to set forth man's thoughts about God. When the theistic philosopher thinks about God, he indulges—as Brunner puts it—in a monologue.



In Christian theology man responds to the Word spoken by God Himself.

It seems to us that there is a place in our theological world both for Dr. WARFIELD and the Barthians on the one hand, and for Schleiermacher and Ritschl and the theistic philosopher on the other. In the one case the essential emphasis is on the Christian faith as supernatural or transcendental. It is a religious or theocentric rather than a philosophical or anthropocentric emphasis. That is why the name of a traditional Calvinist like Dr. WARFIELD may be associated with those of Neo-Calvinists like Karl Barth and Brunner. In the other case the essential emphasis is on the subjective system of thought. The formulation of the system proceeds upon the report of faith as to the true nature of God; and the effort is made to harmonize the idea of God with the rest of experience, in accordance with the synoptic view of philosophy.

The problem of evolution, which has been the cause of so much controversy and heart-burning, is really a very simple one from the religious point of view. One question alone vitally concerns the Christian thinker, namely, whether the process of evolution is fortuitous or purposive. If it be declared to be the product of blind chance, then, obviously, it is incompatible with any Christian or theistic belief. But if there is purpose in it, if it be taken as the product of mind, then we may accept it as indicating the way in which God made the world. All that the Christian man is concerned with in this connexion is the acknowledgment that the world, in whatever way designed, is God's world.

This, of course, is a question not for science, but for philosophy and theology. The scientist, if he confines himself strictly to his own field, can only tell us that things are thus and thus. The question of why they are thus and thus he cannot answer, or if he attempts an answer he has entered the realm of philosophy and theology. At the same time it is to be expected that the facts which science

has brought to light as to the nature of the world may give us some hint of the Divine purpose controlling it. The more we can understand of the What and Whence, the better able are we to discern the Whither and the Why.

To this question Sir J. Arthur THOMSON, LL.D., addressed himself in a short series of lectures recently delivered before the University of Durham, and now published under the title of *Purpose in Evolution* (Milford; 2s. 6d. net). The lectures are three in number, and they deal with, first, purpose in evolution; second, disharmonies and difficulties; and third, lessons from evolution. Needless to say they are written with all Professor THOMSON'S well-known charm of diction and quaint play of fancy, with all his scientific insight and reverent imagination.

He finds that 'the general idea of Purpose is legitimate in scientific inquiry, and cannot be dispensed with.' Not only in human activity is purpose present and dominant, but in many of the activities of the higher animals 'we cannot make sense of them unless we admit an operative perceptual purpose.' Turning to the fields of physiology and embryology we find it difficult to dispense with some form of the teleological idea. The whole organization of a living body works as if it had a purpose, the embryo develops as if it were purposive. 'The machine analogy does not work out very well in physiology; it is certainly not easier in embryology, for the embryo-machine makes itself as it goes on, often takes itself to pieces, in part or as a whole, and begins again, and often before it finishes with itself produces a stock of little machines for the next season.' Romanes said that 'wherever you tap Organic Nature it seems to flow with purpose,' and Darwin himself, in treating of the abundance of adaptation in organisms, 'found it a little difficult not to talk like Paley.'

Coming now to the philosophic question of whether, behind the process of evolution, there is some Divine purpose, a Supreme Reality of whose Spirit it is the expression, we find that science offers certain data which are, to say the least,



highly suggestive. There is, first of all, the orderliness of Nature. We live in a cosmos, not a fortuitous concourse of atoms, and it is difficult to conceive this without postulating Mind. A similar impression is made by 'the practical omnipresence of beauty in Animate Nature.' Other considerations which have to be taken account of are such as these—the apparent uniqueness of our earth, the preparations both in the inorganic and the organic worlds for the advent of higher things. 'Broad foundations were laid which made a lofty superstructure possible.' The evidences of progress in evolution are also most impressive. 'We think of evolution too unimaginatively. We do not, for instance, sufficiently realize the teleological interest of great trends that are, as it were, anticipatory of man's higher values—the true, the beautiful, and the good. For there are prolonged pre-human trends in favour of nimble wits, clear-headedness, and facing the facts; also trends in favour of beauty and its appreciation; also trends in favour of the primary virtues like courage and affection.'

---

And the present climax of it all is man. Does a survey of the whole process suggest that Nature is blind in her working? Does it suggest that organic evolution is a chapter of accidents? On the contrary, we get a strong impression of a great original purpose which is being progressively and patiently worked out.

---

But there are difficulties in the way of this theory which must be faced. We must not ignore 'the seamy side, the discords, and the shadows in Nature.' Professor THOMSON comments somewhat severely on the arraignment of Nature made by John Stuart Mill and William James, philosophers 'with only a nodding acquaintance with Nature.' He treats with more respect the criticisms of Huxley, though he takes care to remind us that Huxley, 'while he was a biologist of the highest rank, was not, as he admits, much of a field naturalist.' Professor THOMSON, in short, is an ardent lover of Nature, and is exceedingly jealous of her good name. He grows manifestly impatient with the view of Nature as red in tooth and claw. 'A nightmare view,' he calls it, and quotes Darwin and Wallace

to the contrary. 'When we reflect,' says Darwin, 'on this struggle, we may console ourselves with the full belief that the war of Nature is not incessant, that no fear is felt, that death is generally prompt, and that the vigorous, the healthy, and the happy survive and multiply.' Wallace writes to the same effect: 'On the whole, then, we may conclude that the popular idea of the struggle for existence entailing misery and pain on the animal world is the very reverse of the truth. What it really brings about is the maximum of life, and of the enjoyment of life, with the minimum of suffering and pain.'

---

The general answer to these difficulties and disharmonies must be 'a counsel of patience.' 'We do not know the whole story. We are a little like children who criticise the parental arrangements which they but dimly understand.' There must be room for freedom of action, which involves of necessity freedom to err. Without this, higher intelligence could never have evolved. Moreover, the evolution story is not yet complete. 'We wish to be quite frank in admitting that there are shadows and difficulties in Nature which give us pause in our religious interpretation. But we plead for a balanced view. . . . No one can shut his eyes to the difficulties, our protest is against allowing them to blot out the sun.' Let it be added that man, of all creatures, has least room to criticise. 'When we think of some of man's evil ways and then of his apologising for Nature, we smile at our own absurdity.'

---

Finally, believing that the general trend of evolution is in the direction of progress rather than retrogression, we naturally raise the question whether our knowledge of the past can help us with our human problems. One lesson would seem to be that the good needs to be sifted out and fostered. This brings us up against what Herbert Spencer called 'the dilemma of civilization,' by which he means the tendency in a civilized society to protect the unfit and make it as well to be inferior as to be superior. 'There seems no escape from the dilemma, save in an increase of rational and social selection, and this is apt to be restrained



by the strengthening of humane sentiments. It is clear, however, that whenever we have an alternative in our judgments and selections, we should reward superiority along every line—the good workman, the reliable, the thoughtful, the loyal, and the strenuous. We are so apt to be kind at the expense of our descendants.’ A second great lesson is that organic progress is three-sided. ‘It concerns Organism, Functioning, and Environment—in other words, the living creature itself, its activities and ongoings, and its influential surroundings.’ Much progress is hindered by man’s proneness to concentrate on one side of the prism, ignoring the others. Progress, to be stable, must take account of all three. A third lesson is centred in the unity of the organism, which implies the importance of the mental as well as the bodily aspect. ‘In all the higher animals it is plain that mentality or sentience counts in the everyday life, and in the racial survival and success.’ This is supremely true of man, and we must beware, in a

dominantly mechanical age, lest we lose our soul amid the abundance of the things which we possess.

‘The general tenor of our argument is that there is progress in Organic Evolution, and that there is hopefulness in ranging ourselves in our endeavours in line with those trends which have been conspicuously progressive in the pre-human ascent of life. It may be said that it is much safer to keep to the lessons of human history, which are sufficient for our guidance. This is a reasonable view, but it must be remembered that men have from time to time appealed to Nature to justify their policy, as the militarists, for instance, have appealed to the struggle for existence. So without admitting that man as a historic being and an ethical agent should ever surrender his birthright to the extent of supposing that he cannot get beyond Nature’s suggestions, we would insist that an appeal to Nature should be all-round and accurate if it is made at all.’

## The Place of Languages in Theological Education.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN E. McFADYEN, D.D., TRINITY COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

THERE is a charming story told by Johannes Keszler, and reproduced *in extenso* by Gustav Freytag in his admirable *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*,<sup>1</sup> of how he and a fellow-student, on their way to Wittenberg to study theology under the Reformers, on the evening of the 4th of March 1522 put up at an inn where they encountered a friendly stranger, whom they took to be a knight, ‘with deep dark eyes that flashed and sparkled like a star.’ In the course of conversation the knight, who seemed strangely familiar with Melancthon, Erasmus, and Luther, and who interspersed his conversation with Latin phrases, advised the young men to study Greek and Hebrew, for ‘these were necessary,’ he said, ‘to the understanding of Holy Scripture.’ On the table in front of the knight lay a book. Keszler’s friend picked it up and noted that it was a Hebrew Psalter. ‘I would give one of the fingers of my hand,’ said he, ‘to be able to read that.’ ‘Well, and so you

will,’ said the knight, ‘if you work hard. I also am anxious to improve my knowledge of it, and I practise the reading of it every day.’ In the sequel the knight turns out to be no other than Martin Luther himself. It is pleasant to record that Luther paid the bill for the students’ supper, and it is amusing to read—though this is irrelevant to my argument—that one of the other guests, unaware of the identity of the ‘knight,’ remarked in the course of the discussion, which turned on the religious ferment of the time, that Luther must either be an angel from heaven or a devil from hell.

The whole story, as indeed the whole period, is alive with the sense of the wonder and the importance of the new learning. The humanists of that day believed in going to the sources; they rejoiced with joy unspeakable in the new-found privilege of drawing from those wells of living water: in them was the fountain of life, in their light they saw light. One cannot help wondering how many theological students of the present day would be willing to give

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. pp. 818–824 (Th. Knaur Nachf., Berlin).



one of the fingers of their hand to be able to read the Psalms in Hebrew. Most of us to-day have little desire to experience the thrill of that ancient joy. But even if we care little to recapture the delight of the humanists in the discovery of new worlds of literature such as Greek and Hebrew, we should remember that as Churchmen we are bound, so far as in us lies, to make acquaintance with the Scriptures in the original tongues; it is to them and not to translations, however excellent, that the final appeal has to be made. In the first chapter of *The Confession of Faith* stand these words: 'The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by His singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; so as in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them.' However reasonably critics might demur to some of this phrasing, the principal statement stands. The Scriptures are the Rock out of which we were hewn. And the obligation of all ministers of the Word to familiarize themselves with that Word in its original form is especially incumbent upon Protestants, who pay less homage than Roman Catholics do to tradition and official interpretation, and who are what they are because their forbears appealed beyond the Church to the Bible. Tennyson had the natural scorn of the layman for the minister who could not read the Bible in the original tongues. One day he asked Jowett 'to give him a literal translation of one of the verses of Job. "But I can't read Hebrew," faltered the Master. "What," he exclaimed, "you the Priest of a religion and can't read your own sacred Books!"'<sup>1</sup> The Protestant minister who understands the genius of Protestantism is bound to qualify himself by every means in his power to exercise his judgment upon the sources of his faith; he has the right, and—what is more important—the duty of private judgment. But that judgment is worth nothing unless it is competent, and competence is the fruit of conscientious study.

Of course it is possible to exaggerate the importance of a knowledge of originals. No man alive can read in the original all the books that a keen student of literature would like to read, or at any rate all the books he ought to know; yet there are men with a more than tolerable knowledge of Homer or Dante or Goethe who could not read a word of Greek or Italian or German. And how

impossible must be the task of the student of Comparative Religion, if a knowledge of original sources be deemed indispensable! Is there any man who could claim to be equally at home in the records of Babylonian, Assyrian, and Egyptian religion, in the Zend-Avesta, in the Rig-Veda and the Analects of Confucius and the *Qur'an*, in Greek philosophy and tragedy, to say nothing of such records as travellers have collected of primitive religions? Obviously the science of Comparative Religion must be studied mainly through the medium of translations. In candour it must also be said that Hebrew at any rate suffers less from translation than probably any other language. In virtue of its simple structure it is immeasurably easier to reproduce with fidelity than languages with a complex structure like Greek or Latin or German. Even Hebrew poetry loses comparatively little in translation, as its rhythm is largely that of thought answering thought, while, so far as the words are concerned, the rhythm is secured not by considering syllables as long or short, but as stressed or unstressed—a feature which is readily reproducible, and indeed almost inevitable, in translation.

Further, apart from the availability of adequate translations, it might be argued that a subtle change has come over the attitude of the Church, or at any rate of her scholars, to Scripture. We no longer bow to the letter; and even if we did, it is often difficult and even impossible, as Old Testament scholars especially are only too painfully aware, to decide what the ultimate letter was. A glance at the footnotes to Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, or, still better, at Nestle's edition of the Greek and Hebrew text of Jeremiah, or at Brooke, M'Lean, and Thackeray's edition of the Greek text of 1 and 2 Samuel, or at Vannutelli's edition of the Greek and Hebrew text of Kings and Chronicles, is enough to dispel for ever the illusion that the original text is recoverable. Besides, it is now universally recognized that Scripture is the record of a revelation which, being progressive, cannot be of the same value in all its parts; and Biblical Theology, viewed from this angle, becomes in one sense Historical Theology, with the consequence that it seems to forfeit its old finality.

Other causes, too, have contributed to the growing dislike of linguistic studies—a dislike amounting in some cases to resentment. The business of a theological college, it is urged, is to equip young men for a ministry to the twentieth century, with its amazing complex of problems of vital importance, social, economic, international; of what relevance is an accurate knowledge of Hebrew

<sup>1</sup> Tennyson: *A Memoir by his Son*, vol. ii. p. 52.



Grammar or Hellenistic Greek to these things? The urgent need is not for more linguistic drill, but for more training by experts in sociology, economics, psychiatry, pedagogy, methods of religious education, the impact of science upon religion, etc. It has also to be frankly, if sorrowfully admitted, that some students of excellent philosophical and theological capacity are almost destitute of linguistic ability. Precious hours are spent in the attempt to learn languages, of which not only will they never be masters, but of which they do not expect ever to make any conceivable use: would it not be well, they urge, to devote our time to studies which will definitely and unchallengeably promote our ministerial efficiency, the more so as most of the scholars of to-day have trained themselves to throw into popular form all that is of permanent value?

It is against the study of Hebrew that the protest is loudest; but it should not be overlooked that, if Hebrew goes, Greek is likely to follow—indeed, there is little reason why it should not. If the principle be once established that for all practical purposes a literature may be effectively studied on the basis of a good translation, that principle is just as applicable to Greek as to Hebrew. Besides, the old argument that in the Greek Gospels we are listening to the very words of our Lord has been irretrievably shattered, for the words there recorded are but a Greek reproduction of the Galilean Aramaic which He spoke, and behind the Gospels lies not only the Semitic mind but frequently Semitic grammar and constructions; so that the retention of Greek would logically carry with it the retention of Semitic studies. It is true that it is that *mind* which was in Jesus that is to be in us, but that mind was expressed in words which are not to be found in the Greek narrative of His sayings and doings.

In our attitude to translations we must beware of exaggeration in either direction. Surely Mr. C. A. Dinsmore, in his fine study of *The English Bible as Literature*, goes too far in one direction when he says that 'the English Bible in the standard versions is a finer and nobler literature than the Scriptures in their original tongues.'<sup>1</sup> This extreme statement he justifies by the remark that while those versions 'preserve in an extraordinary degree the best qualities of the original, they have a unique and superior beauty of their own, created by the contributions of many men and many races. Greece and Rome and England have all brought their glory and honor into it.' But perhaps Pro-

fessor Meinhold goes too far in the other direction when he maintains that 'as every translation, even the best, is and remains only a translation, it can never reproduce the original in all its uniqueness and splendour.'<sup>2</sup> This sentence occurs in the course of a plea for the obligatory study of Hebrew. A student of the Evangelical Church, he says, must learn to investigate the literature and religion of Israel with every means at his disposal. To do this, 'he must master the Hebrew language, and every attempt to dispense him from that obligation is, like all attempts which aim at making culture easy, to be resolutely opposed, because they lead to superficiality. Luther was right when he urged us to "keep hard at the languages, for language is the sheath in which the sword of the spirit rests."' And he continues: 'Any one who would have real contact with the spirit of antiquity must read the Greek thinkers and poets in their own language. Take the choruses of Æschylus and Sophocles with all their marvellous music and beauty; even the best translation pales beside them. The same is true of the Old Testament. Any one who would know and enjoy the prophets in all their commanding austerity and wonderful tenderness, must read and hear them in their own language. Only then will the breath of their spirit be upon his and will he receive from them their full religious impression. And everything depends upon this, that we suffer those heroic religious figures to work directly upon us. He who possesses that power is in a position to deal fittingly with the Old Testament in teaching and preaching.' This is well said and worth saying. But honesty compels us to admit that effective preaching of the Old Testament is not incompatible with a knowledge of the Hebrew language that occasionally comes a long way short of 'mastery.'

Yet in spite of all that can be urged against the linguistic demand, it would be a mistake to eliminate Hebrew entirely from the studies even of those who have no linguistic gift, and a mistake of only a lesser order to make it optional—for reasons which will presently be suggested. Of course it would be folly to plead for Hebrew as integral to a normal theological course, if that language were one of exceptional difficulty. But the very reverse is the case. Doubtless Hebrew has initial difficulties of its own—its unfamiliar alphabet, its monotonously triliteral roots, and the unlikeness of some of its sounds to any in our own language. On the other

<sup>2</sup> *Das Alte Testament und evangelisches Christentum*, p. 131. Meinhold develops this argument at length in his *Einführung in das Alte Testament*, pp. 4-6.

<sup>1</sup> P. 38 f.



hand—as is clear enough even from the English Bible—its working vocabulary is small; its syntax, broadly speaking, extremely simple; and the application of its basic principles is so methodical as to be almost mechanical. So true is this that if, instead of burdening his memory and ruining his temper with the memorizing of paradigms, the student early learns to appreciate and apply those underlying principles, he will find that most of the seeming irregularities vanish and reduce themselves to order. There is no reason whatever why any man of average intelligence, industry, and leisure, who has already acquired a moderate knowledge of one foreign language, ancient or modern, should fail to acquire in a considerably shorter time a similar knowledge of Hebrew. Hebrew, like Christianity itself, has often been proclaimed impossible by those who have never given it a chance.

I have before me a letter received recently, which incidentally discusses this very subject. The opinion therein expressed is of special interest and value, as it was entirely unsolicited, and it is the opinion of a man whose ministerial work has been done not in soft and sheltered places, but in poor districts of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen, where the battle has been hard. This is what he says: 'Each man who cannot read the Old Testament in the original should realize, deeply pricked in his conscience, that he had sinned and was sinning against God. The man who has so little reverence for the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament that through laziness or frivolity or mere shallowness of soul he scamps his Hebrew, writes himself down as totally unfit for the holy responsibility of a cure of souls and as without adequate knowledge "rightly to divide the word of truth." It is entirely beside the point to say that there are such able and correct translations of the Old Testament that a man need not study the Hebrew. Without a moderate knowledge of Hebrew—and that is all that the average student will ever attain to—no man is able to appreciate the value of an able translation or to use it as an interpretation of any text he might attempt to expound. But, apart from all that, there are two considerations, both of which are vital. (i) A man preparing for the Holy Ministry is not honourable, he is not even *honest*, who pretends to shuffle through a subject which he never attempts to study. And (ii) education and especially *radical* knowledge of the Old and New Testaments are the very sheet-anchor of Protestantism.' I should not myself have ventured to put the case so strongly; but such a statement, coming from one whose experience has given him

the right to utter it, should be carefully pondered by prospective ministers who are airily prepared to resile from our great Protestant tradition and whose experience is yet to win. Despised, or at any rate rejected, by some would-be servants of the Church, Hebrew has more than once laid her spell upon the lay mind. Matthew Arnold learned Hebrew in his forty-ninth year,<sup>1</sup> and we find Tennyson, when he was fifty-eight, discussing the exact pronunciation of *ו* and reading difficult books like Job and the Song.<sup>2</sup>

No one contends that the working minister needs to have a minute acquaintance with Hebrew for the effective prosecution of his ministry, but an elementary knowledge at any rate is desirable, if not indispensable, for the following reasons: (i) Without such a knowledge many of the problems connected with Old Testament Science are unintelligible. One of the arguments, for example, which support and confirm the documentary analysis of the Hexateuch, is based upon language. The Jahwist and the Priestly versions of the Flood story use different words for *destroy* (מָחָה, הִשְׁחִית); the Jahwist and the Elohist versions of the Joseph story use different words for *sack* (מִמְחָה, שָׁק), and so on. These distinctions, obscured in the English Version, are palpable in the Hebrew; to be told about them carries nothing like the same conviction as to see the words themselves. If it be argued that documentary analysis is a minor matter, of no concern to the preacher, surely the reply is that part of his business, as an intelligent student of religious history, is to understand the course which Hebrew religion ran, and the analysis of the Hexateuch into its constituent documents (J, E, D, and P) is one of the surest guides to that course.

Again, some knowledge of textual criticism will often throw light upon obscurities and difficulties which obstruct the progress of the reader who has only his English Version to depend on. As the simplest illustration, take the frequent confusion between the Hebrew words for *not* (אֵין) and *to him* (אֵלָיו), which are both pronounced in the same way (*lō*)—a confusion which has gravely affected two important passages, Is 9<sup>3</sup> and Job 13<sup>15</sup>. It is painful to hear on Christmas morning, as I once heard, the former passage read as it appears in A.V., 'Thou hast multiplied the nation, and *not* increased the joy'—which should beyond question be rendered, 'and increased *its* joy'—the joy *to it*.

<sup>1</sup> See the letters of Dec. 12 and 23, 1871, in G. W. E. Russell's *Letters of Matthew Arnold*, vol. ii. p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> *A Memoir by his Son*, vol. ii. p. 52.



And though it is not painful, it is unfortunate that Job, at the stage of the discussion reached in 13<sup>15</sup>, should be represented as saying, 'Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him,' when what he really said was something like this, 'Behold, he is slaying me, I have no hope,' or, 'I can hold out no longer.' Further, the innumerable word-plays in the Hebrew<sup>1</sup> are utterly lost upon the most vigilant reader of the English version. Here, again, it is foolish to say that such things are immaterial, for sometimes they are introduced with great oratorical and dramatic propriety, notably, for example, in the closing words of Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard.<sup>2</sup> As they stand in our Bibles, they make next to no impression; indeed, the last line is scarcely intelligible—'He looked for righteousness, but behold a cry.' Doubtless they have never been successfully rendered in English<sup>3</sup> by anybody; the latest unhappy attempt—by Mr. W. Popper—illustrates the all-but-hopeless nature of the translator's task:

He hoped for the good,  
But behold, there is blood!  
And for the right,  
But behold, there is fright!

But in the Hebrew the skill of the climax stares the reader in the face: 'He looked for **משפט**, and behold **משפח**; he looked for **צדקה**, and behold **צעקה**'; that is, he looked for justice, and behold, something quite like it—as like it as the bad grapes in the Song were like the good—but something which was in reality at the other end of the moral world altogether. The second line might be paraphrased thus: 'Instead of the right that he looked for was the cry of the wronged.' But this fails to bring out the incisive word-play, which nobody who heard Isaiah that day would ever forget.

There are scores of similar points, at which the intelligent reader of a translation who gives his author credit for writing sense, inevitably stumbles, but which are instantly illuminated by the light of a textual criticism which can only be appreciated by one who has at least a little knowledge of the language. Perhaps the most interesting illustration of this is Ps 34<sup>10</sup>, which in A.V. and R.V. runs thus: 'The young lions do lack and suffer hunger;

but they that seek the LORD shall not want any good thing.' How, on any theory of poetic parallelism, the 'young lions' of the one line can be balanced by 'those that seek the LORD' in the other, it is not easy to see. But, quite apart from this, one who remembers the uniformly tender regard of the Old Testament for animals, even the wild animals—the wolf, the leopard, the bear,<sup>4</sup> the raven,<sup>5</sup> even the lion<sup>6</sup>—can only be surprised and offended by the sentiment of the first line. The growl of the basses in the well-known anthem may be impressive enough, but it is a sheer irrelevance to the thought of the Psalmist, and almost an insult to the general thought of the Old Testament. But without any change whatever in the consonantal text, the offence vanishes when we notice that the same word (**כפרים**) can be pointed to mean 'the unfaithful.' They may lack and suffer hunger, but, etc. The same Aramaic word is used in the Syriac New Testament for denying Jesus,<sup>7</sup> and its Arabic equivalent denotes unbelievers. The contrast is now seen to be not only relevant but admirable.

There are few things more interesting than to watch the transformations which later editors have wrought upon the text—how, for example, in the story of Josiah's reformation 'the high places of the satyrs' (**שְׁעִירִים**) has been adroitly transformed into the innocent, if meaningless, 'high places of the gates' (**שְׁעָרִים**),<sup>8</sup> in order to obliterate traces of an ancient and discredited worship; or how, for a similar reason, the Queen of Sheba's exclamation, 'Happy are thy wives' (LXX, *αἱ γυναῖκες σου*, **נִשְׂיָר**) has, by the adroit addition of an **נ**, been reduced to the innocuous 'happy are thy men' (**אֲנָשֶׁיךָ**).<sup>9</sup> Considerations of space prevent me from developing this aspect of the argument, which could easily be illustrated on an extensive scale.

(ii) Even for his own homiletic purposes the preacher who knows no Hebrew misses much. If he has imagination enough, he can see Goodness and Mercy, like two angel figures, following the footsteps of the man who wrote Ps 23. But how much keener is his thrill as an expositor, when, on looking at the word **רָדַף**, he remembers that **רָדַף** means 'to pursue'—the regular word for the pursuit of the enemy in battle—and sees in the word a graphic picture of the unwearied persistence of the Divine love, which the Psalmist feels to be pursuing him with the zeal of a foe as well as with the love of a Father. Or again, take the words of David before

<sup>1</sup> Also in the Greek, as in Mt 16<sup>18</sup>, 'Thou art *Peter* (*Πέτρος*), and on this rock (*πέτρα*) I will build my church.'

<sup>2</sup> Is 5<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Duhm has thus happily rendered them in German:

Er hoffte auf gut Regiment und sieh da: ein Blut-regiment,  
Auf Rechtsprechung und sieh da: Rechtsbrechung!

<sup>4</sup> Is 11<sup>6f</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Job 38<sup>41</sup>, Ps 147<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Job 38<sup>39f</sup>, Is 11<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Mt 10<sup>32</sup>, 2 P 2<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> 2 K 23<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> 1 K 10<sup>8</sup>.



his encounter with Goliath, as recorded in A.V., 'Thy servant kept his father's sheep, and there came a lion and a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock; and I went out after him, and smote him, and delivered it out of his hand.'<sup>1</sup> More accurate attention to the use of the tenses reveals the fact that these encounters were frequent. David had a rich experience of struggles with lions and bears, and the preacher who knows his Hebrew Grammar will be quick to note the point that while God will use the men who trust Him, He can do most with them when they are trained. It was a hand already practised and skilled that slung the stone which laid the giant low. The man who has trained his powers will meet a grave crisis more intelligently and will render the better service. Again, no translation can, without clumsiness and circumlocution, do justice to the Hebrew prophetic perfect.<sup>2</sup> To the men who could envisage the future so confidently that they could describe it with perfect tense, time mattered little. A whole philosophy of history is latent in this grammatical usage. What is determined by God, however far distant may be its consummation in time, is already as good as done; it only needs to be projected on to the stage of history. But no words can convey the atmosphere which such an idiom carries. This argument could also be developed indefinitely.

(iii) Atmosphere—that is the last point I wish to make. Any one who knows at first hand any foreign literature will readily admit that in the best of translations an indefinable something has vaporated. The rendering may be excellent—Keats's immortal lines are an incomparable tribute to the spell of Chapman's *Homer*—but it is other. Who that knows Virgil, 'wielder of the stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man,' would affirm that his matchless arrangement of words, his noble cadences, his solemn grandeur, can be even approximately conveyed by the subtlest of translations? This, while less true of the Bible than of most great literature, is still true; and those who deny it have to be reminded that the people who are best able to estimate the value of the knowledge for which we have been pleading are those who possess it, not those who have never taken the trouble to acquire it. The Church does not expect all her ministers to be scholars, but she has the right to expect that they be scholarly.

My contention here is that even a little knowledge of Hebrew is vastly better than none, and that it

will be an evil day for the preacher and the student of theology if the natural tendency to dilettantism be encouraged by complete exemption from linguistic studies. But it is obvious that, if all Biblical study in Theological Colleges is to be based upon the original texts, very large tracts of the Bible must remain untravellered. The remedy for this is to make more liberal use of the English Bible. The minuter study of selected Biblical books on the basis of the original languages can be profitably supplemented by a more rapid exegesis of other books, which, while no less adequate and scientific in treatment, concentrates more deliberately upon the things that matter—often just the things which suffer most in more detailed study, where too often the wood is obscured by the trees. This suggestion is made in the interests of all, and not only of those whose linguistic equipment is meagre, for there ought to be range as well as depth in study, vision as well as scholarship—and I make it the more readily, as I have tested its value. For over twenty-five years, in Toronto and Glasgow, it has been my custom to devote one day a week to the English Bible, not indeed ignoring the Hebrew text, where that had anything of special interest in itself or of value to the exposition, but dealing in the main with the larger thought of the book. In this way books which by reason of their length or difficulty could not have been read in the original by an ordinary class in the time at their disposal could be treated in a way which did at least approximate justice to their contents.

The pressure of this problem, which is beginning to be felt in Britain, has long been felt in America, and the remedy was ably discussed, as far back as twenty-one years ago, in a leading article of *The Biblical World*, from which I take the liberty of quoting a few of the more apposite sentences. The writer contended that 'to read Hebrew, to know its syntax, even to interpret the books of the Old Testament or of the New, are only means to an end; the thing desired is the discovery of the history of the religious thought and spiritual life of the Hebrew people, and the interpretation and valuation of this life with a view to the contribution which it can make to the development of the highest type of life to-day.' In view of this he argued that 'the study of the Bible on the basis of the original languages and the study of it through the medium of the English Version must stand side by side in the curriculum of the theological school. Neither must be allowed to displace the other or to crowd the other into a place of inferiority. The study of the Bible in English should not be looked upon as a

<sup>1</sup> 1 S 17<sup>34</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Am 5<sup>8</sup>, 'The virgin of Israel has fallen';

3<sup>9</sup>, 'Judah has fallen.'



makeshift for inferior students, nor should the study of the original languages be reserved for a few dry-as-dust would-be professors.' Further, 'the legitimate demand made upon the student's time and energy in other fields of study prevents him from giving sufficient attention to the Old Testament to enable him to feel at home both in the linguistic and in the historical and theological phases of Hebrew literature. Experience shows that, when Hebrew was a required subject in the theological curriculum, the students secured, in the majority of cases, neither a satisfactory command of Hebrew nor an adequate understanding of the meaning and value of the Old Testament.' In spite of this, however, 'for some time it seems probable that, with rare exceptions, a knowledge of one of the Biblical languages should be required, in order to introduce the student to a kind of study which cannot be pursued, and to give him a point of view which cannot be acquired, solely through the study of the Bible in English.' And the conclusion of the whole matter is this, that 'the English Bible should be used, not chiefly to avoid the labour of using Hebrew or Greek, but to enable professor and student to do a kind of scholarly work in which

the use of the original languages, except for occasional reference, is easily dispensed with, and thus to acquire a larger and deeper knowledge of the Bible and its religion. Thus used, it becomes an instrument for the promotion of scholarship, and a means of developing an effective ministry.'

Provision for minute linguistic study must always be made for those—and they will be few—who have the gift and the inclination for it; but no less must provision be made for those—and they will always be the majority—who desire a working knowledge of the great literature on which their ministry is to be built, and by which it is to be inspired. But these disciplines, though disparate, are not irreconcilable. The linguist must remember that he is one day to be a preacher, and that he should covet earnestly the spirit and power of prophecy; and the man of meagre linguistic gift, remembering that, but for the scholar, there would have been no English Bible at all, should be willing and glad to acquaint himself, so far as opportunity offers, with those words of 'spirit and life,' in the form in which they fell from the lips of the ancestors of his faith.

---

## Modern Theophobia: The Case of Mr. Bertrand Russell.

BY HERBERT G. WOOD, SELLY OAK, BIRMINGHAM.

MR. ARNOLD LUNN's lively critique of present-day humanism, entitled *The Flight from Reason*, would deserve a warm welcome if he had done nothing else but coin and put into circulation the challenging term 'Theophobia.' He suggests that behind the restlessness and irrationality of the secularism which is so fashionable to-day lies nothing but a fearful reluctance to admit the reality of God. This is a startling suggestion, and yet it certainly seems to be near the truth.

The existence of a phobia will be detected by the way in which it weights the scales in argument. Bradley's notorious description of metaphysics as the discovery of bad reasons for what we believe upon instinct, has at least this much truth in it, that where we find a thinker, particularly an able and critical thinker, treating bad reasons as

good ones, regarding as important and final arguments which are rather obviously neither final nor important, then we may justly suspect that the will to believe or an emotional desire not to believe is loading the logical dice. Does the literature of modern humanism furnish examples which tend to confirm the truth of Mr. Arnold Lunn's diagnosis?

Unless my own judgment is distorted by emotional bias, it would seem that Mr. Bertrand Russell in his confession of faith, *What I believe*, provides a striking illustration of Mr. Lunn's thesis. Mr. Bertrand Russell is probably the most brilliant as well as the most influential of the leaders of modern humanism. He is deservedly admired as a singularly courageous thinker, who cares nothing for convention and who follows, with an acute



logical mind, the truth where'er it leads. In his writings, therefore, we should expect to find a genuinely dispassionate unprejudiced handling of great issues, and indeed the general impression that his judgments are of this character is one main reason for the respect with which they are received by a wide circle. Yet a closer analysis of some of the commonplaces of his thought raises the question whether his admirers have not confused contempt for tradition with freedom from prejudice. At least the page in *What I believe* in which Mr. Russell dismisses belief in God and immortality would seem to point to this conclusion.

Mr. Bertrand Russell, in summarizing the reasons why he does not believe in God and immortality, commits himself to three propositions which he clearly regards as important and conclusive. First of all, these beliefs find no support in science; secondly, they are not essential to religion, as they are not part of original Buddhism, and Buddhism is a religion; thirdly, there is no more reason to believe in the God and Father of Jesus Christ or in the Jahweh of the Jews than there is to believe in Zeus or Osiris or Marduk. All are equally imaginary figures. For these reasons then Mr. Russell feels justified in leaving theism on one side. Yet to a genuinely critical intelligence these reasons must seem either irrelevant or, if not actually untenable, then certainly disputable and inconclusive.

At first sight there is something impressive about the assertion that faith in God and belief in immortality find no support in science. To the sensitive mind it suggests, and is perhaps intended to suggest, that loyalty to science forbids us to hold these beliefs for which science provides no evidence or support. It may be worth while to recall at the outset that this generalization about science is not itself a scientific judgment. It is a common secularist opinion which has behind it neither the weight of empirical evidence, nor yet any logical compulsion, since it rests on demonstrably mistaken conceptions of science and of the nature of religious belief. According to a judgment of Sir James Jeans, it is perhaps time that science left off making pronouncements. It is certainly time that critical philosophers left off making pronouncements in the name of science in general.

If, however, we assume the truth of the judgment that science gives no support to theism, what follows? Mrs. Plunket Greene records of her father, Sir Hubert Parry, that in reflecting on the bearing of science on faith in God and immortality, he said: 'We are not forbidden to hope.' 'Ah,

the humanist will say, 'that is just where the higher morality of the modern scientific outlook comes in. We, the devotees of science, will not admit any belief for which we have not positive scientific evidence.' Some such position is assumed, if Mr. Russell's generalization about science is to carry his point. But is such a position tenable, is it rational? The Pragmatists would appear to be right at least in asserting that there are issues on which we do not possess adequate 'scientific' evidence and on which we cannot be neutral. Immortality is one of these issues. We must either, with Aristotle, determine to live as if we were immortal, or, with Mr. Russell, we must resolve to build our lives on the foundation of despair. In either case we make a choice, and the one option is not more scientific than the other. The attitude of Mr. Russell is not in the faintest degree more loyal to science than that of Aristotle. Indeed, it may fairly be claimed that to be loyal to science we must in practice follow Aristotle even if in theory we incline to Mr. Russell.

The humanist argument in favour of Mr. Russell's position on this issue of immortality will run somewhat as follows: 'If we entertain the hope of immortality, we are opting for the alternative which makes for our comfort, which flatters our self-esteem, and for that very reason we ought to reject it. Stern self-discipline requires us to distrust so congenial a hope.' But this attitude appears to be nothing but a reproduction of the Kantian assumption that duty and happiness never coincide. Of course it is our duty to face disagreeable truths, but to assume that of two alternative possibilities the more disagreeable is the more likely to be true, is a simple fallacy. This particular fallacy incidentally underlies and vitiates the whole of Mr. Bertrand Russell's *Free Man's Worship*. And how will the argument stand if it should turn out that the desire which on this hypothesis prompts and sustains faith in God and immortality is not simply the desire of the timid for shelter and comfort, but something at least as deep-seated and instinctive as hunger and thirst, and as rational and irrepressible as the curiosity which inspires science? In that case, we are asked in loyalty to science to mutilate our own fundamental nature, and any one who so reads the situation will be obliged to conclude that the humanists have misconceived either science or what is involved in loyalty to science or both. In any case, before any one assumes that the neutrality of science, which is all that can be honestly affirmed, is a sufficient ground for reject-

ing both theism and the belief in immortality, he ought at least to investigate the nature of the desire or desires that prompt men to accept these beliefs. If he does not do so, it would seem that his hasty rejection of such beliefs merely on the ground of the alleged neutrality of science is not dictated by loyalty to science, but by some prejudice, emotionally held, which he has failed to detect and analyse.

It may, however, be suggested that the obligation imposed on us by the present position of scientific knowledge is that of suspense of judgment. We may indeed entertain hope, if we like to take the risk of disillusionment, and if we remember that hope is merely hope and not knowledge. Anything more involves us in disloyalty to science. But here again a question arises. It is reasonable to suspend our judgment on such beliefs as are under discussion, on the ground that at the moment they find no support in science, if, and only if, the advance of science were likely to provide us with the evidence for a more definite conclusion hereafter, whether such conclusion were negative or positive. We are bound to inquire whether science, in the sense which Mr. Russell obviously attributes to the word, is ever going to be in a position to determine these issues for us. In other words, does the decision as to the reasonableness of faith in God and immortality turn, or is it likely to turn, on the results of the detailed inquiries of the physicists and of the scientists whose methods approximate to those of the physicist? I should have thought that obviously the last word on these issues does not lie and cannot lie with science so defined. Lack of support from science, if it be truly asserted, is none the less irrelevant or at least inconclusive. Behind the assertion of the grave significance of this failure of science to corroborate these beliefs lies the idea that religious beliefs are essentially of the nature of scientific hypotheses, resting on the same kind of evidence and to be tested in the same kind of way. To expose the fallacy that lurks in all this mode of thinking it is sufficient to recall the old story of the Scots divine who began a prayer with the words, 'O Thou who art our only hope and ultimate hypothesis!' If the humanist cannot see the humour of this, he has not begun to understand religion. If he does see the humour of this, then he must cease to speak of belief in God as if it were an hypothesis like the theory of relativity, which must abide the judgment of the physicists. The modern secularist attitude at this point merely produces the outworn philosophy of Comte, which treated

religious beliefs as nothing but crude metaphysical theories or equally crude scientific hypotheses. There is something more in religion than that, and to that something more science in the narrow sense of the term has little or nothing to say. Truth in religion is doubtless to be subjected to scientific tests, but those tests are not in the hands of the physicist or any other scientist of the same order. To suppose otherwise is to repeat the mistake of Laplace, who imagined that he had given the Lord God His *congé*, because he did not require God as an hypothesis in his *Celestial Mechanics*. There is no reason to suppose that any advance in physics will make it very much easier or very much harder to believe in God and immortality than it is at present, since the main evidence in support of such beliefs does not lie in that region of inquiry. To suspend one's judgment, therefore, on the ground that science has not yet provided the evidence for a rational judgment, is to ape the folly of the peasant who waited for the stream to go by in the hope of crossing dry-shod.

Even, however, in the narrow sense which Mr. Russell gives to the word 'science,' Mr. Russell's judgment does not appear to be well founded. Modern science in general and modern physics in particular, alike in their presuppositions and in their findings, seem to require a spiritual interpretation of the universe, if they do not directly support belief in God and immortality. The only generalization about science which is tolerably certain is that its very possibility is inconsistent with materialism or with any philosophy that comes to practically the same thing as materialism. The only philosophy which would seem to be expressly excluded by science is the mechanistic, materialistic philosophy which the rationalist persists in regarding as somehow peculiarly scientific. This is true even of physics. It is still more obviously true if the term 'science' be extended as it should be to include history.

Many years ago Mr. Russell contributed to the *Independent Review* a valuable paper on history in which he discerned clearly the fundamental distinction between history and 'science,' as we usually understand the term. He pointed out that we are interested in historical facts, in particular events of the past, for their own sakes and not merely or chiefly as examples or illustrations of general laws. In this lies the peculiar character of history as contrasted with physics and with all types of science which tend to approximate to physics. History deals with the unique unrepeatable aspect of our experience, which no advance



in the mathematical or quasi-mathematical sciences can ever overtake or exhaustively explain. Unhappily, Mr. Russell has not, so far as I know, followed up the insight which he possessed when he wrote the article in the *Independent Review*. Had he done so, he might have been a much greater philosopher than he actually is. Not only has he apparently failed to think out for himself all that is involved in this recognition of the concern of history as a science with that which is individual, but also he does not seem ever to have reckoned with the profound and suggestive thinking on this subject which we owe to men like Rickert and Troeltsch in Germany, Henri Berr in France, and Croce in Italy. He has not even considered, so far as I can see, what is involved in Bury's conception of history as a science. In his *Outline of Philosophy*, Mr. Russell is content with this meagre reference to history: 'Historical facts often have importance in the present: for example, wills or laws not yet repealed' (p. 96). To select wills and laws not yet repealed as the typically important historical facts, might well make a scientific historian like Bury turn in his grave. Nor is it surprising that the philosophy of a thinker who is content with such a casual estimate of history should be thin and unsubstantial, and unsatisfying to any genuinely modern mind. History cannot, in the nature of the case, be reduced to physics and psychology, and a philosophy built, as Mr. Russell's is, on these two sciences, is necessarily one-sided and incomplete. But the immediate point is the bearing of the recognition of history as a science upon Mr. Russell's generalization that the beliefs in God and immortality find no support in science. The generalization is at once disproved. Without asserting that history as a science establishes these beliefs, it is self-evident that history supplies whatever support in human experience these beliefs possess. It is open to any man to say that the support for these beliefs forthcoming from history is to his mind inadequate and unconvincing. It is not open to any one to assert that such support is negligible or non-existent. The science that is most germane to the discussion of these beliefs is history, and this science was clearly not in Mr. Russell's mind when he said that these beliefs find no support in science.

This neglect of history invalidates the other considerations adduced to justify contempt for theism. We are told that beliefs in God and immortality cannot be essential to religion because these two beliefs are not among the dogmas of primitive Buddhism. This line of thought has

been a commonplace in certain circles since Dr. McTaggart stressed it in *Some Dogmas of Religion*, and went out of his way to discover a definition of religion which in order to include Buddhism left out the essential features of other faiths. That forms of religion exist, possessing no clear conception of God or of personal immortality, is of course a simple statement of fact. That primitive Buddhism offers the finest example of such a type of religion is the accepted opinion of most students in this field. But to regard the highest common factor of the great religions as comprising the essential truths of religion is a mistake of a tyro in the comparative study of religions. To discard theism because it is absent from primitive Buddhism is about as sensible as to depreciate the octave on which Western music depends because the Chinese have a scale of five notes only. The musical critic who gravely affirmed that the octave is not essential to music would be asserting an undeniable truth and would rightly be written down an ass. The truth would only be significant if with the smaller scale of notes we could produce the same results as with the octave. The appeal to Buddhism as evidence that beliefs in God and immortality are not essential to true religion would only be valid if the appellant proceed to show that Buddhism is capable of sustaining a form of moral and spiritual consciousness as good as or better than that which is associated with these discredited beliefs. But this involves a labour of historical research and an essay in moral valuation, which are never undertaken by those who suffer from Theophobia, and only want some airy generalization to justify them in dismissing an unpleasant subject from their minds.

Still more ludicrous in its contempt for history and for the scientific study of religion is Mr. Bertrand Russell's third line of argument. 'The Christian God may exist: so may the Gods of Olympus or of ancient Egypt or Babylon. But no one of these hypotheses is more probable than any other: they lie outside the region of even probable knowledge and therefore there is no reason to consider any of them.' Presumably it takes a mathematician with a scorn for history to produce such an argument. It can only be valid on one of two assumptions. Either we must assume that in origin, character, and consequences these 'hypotheses' are exactly alike, or else that though these beliefs differ essentially in the part they have played in human experience, yet this difference affords not the slightest probability that one is truer than another. The first assumption is

thoroughly bad history, and the second is thoroughly bad philosophy. That Mr. Bertrand Russell should commit himself so hastily to such absurdities is fairly clear evidence of the soundness of Mr. Arnold Lunn's diagnosis. The humanists are in such a

hurry to get rid of God that they are unwilling and, it would seem, afraid to face the facts of religious history, and yet they constantly pose before the public as the open-minded, unprejudiced champions of the spirit of truth!

## Literature.

### HARTMANN'S ETHIK.

WE have pleasure in directing attention to Hartmann's notable work on Ethics, which is now beginning to be available in English translation. As the author is probably unknown to many of our readers, we may mention that at present, fifty years of age, he holds the Chair adorned by Schleiermacher and Troeltsch in the University of Berlin. Formerly he taught in Marburg and Cologne. It was the War that turned his mind decisively to the problems of the moral life. Serving in the German trenches on the Eastern front, under the thunder of the guns he pondered deeply on moral values, and read, as occasion offered, Aristotle and Nietzsche. Before that, he had felt the power of Plato and Kant, Leibniz and Hegel. Since then he has been greatly influenced by the methodology of Husserl and the analyses of Max Scheler.

Some six years ago appeared his massive *Ethik*, a work so comprehensive and so deep-sighted that even an unfavourable critic declared, 'Hartmann has had only one great predecessor, Aristotle.' In truth, no thinker since Plato has attempted a study of the moral life on so large a scale.

The translator has wisely broken up the original one volume into three which are to deal respectively with Moral Phenomena, Moral Values, and Moral Freedom. Only the first is yet before us—*Ethics*, by Professor Nicolai Hartmann, volume i. (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). Mr. Stanton Coit's translation is exceptionally felicitous; the book is an English book. Dr. Muirhead in a very helpful introduction warns us that we shall find some part of the second volume rather hard reading. In this the style is limpid and the argumentation close indeed, but always clear and cogent.

It promises to be if not an epoch-making, at least an epoch-marking work. Hartmann modestly warns us that he is but a pioneer, that many thinkers

must contribute before the theory of values can be said to be definitely formulated; but his own contribution is a weighty one.

For some time Ethics has been in a bad way. Theory based on Kant ran itself out in 'self-realization,' the ambiguity of which is felt by all; Utilitarianism does not survive deep probing; what else is there apart from clap-trap behaviourism and relativism which is virtually agnostic? Hartmann makes a fresh start. Not that he is absolutely the first in the line he adopts; but he takes that line in greater earnestness than his predecessors.

He aims not so much at a moral philosophy as at a philosophy of moral experience. He holds so far by Kant, but reaches back to Plato. His interest is not in moral ends, but in values. Until the whole system is before us we do not feel able or called on to pass judgment. We shall be interested to see how he defines that 'independence' of Ethics—especially over against religion—towards which this volume points. Meantime we commend the work to all interested in what is surely the most vitally interesting of all studies—the moral life.

### THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY LAND.

Surely no Biblical scholar of the last two generations has placed the religious public under a heavier debt than the Very Reverend Principal of the University of Aberdeen. By his unique combination of learning, insight, imagination, and eloquence, he opened for multitudes the fascinating world of Hebrew prophecy, and it is not a little curious that from the same pen has come one of the most brilliant contributions to the geography of Palestine that has ever been made.

It is nearly forty years since Sir George Adam Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* was first published, and the twenty-fifth edition, re-



vised throughout, has just made its appearance (Hodder & Stoughton; 25s. net). This must surely be a unique record for an elaborate book dealing with geography, and it constitutes a remarkable tribute to its proved excellence as well as to its continued popularity. It is almost an impertinence to commend a book whose graceful narrative has charmed thousands of readers and whose accuracy has been tested under the stern and exacting conditions of war—for Field-Marshal Viscount Allenby found it invaluable, 'a true guide and counsellor' in the prosecution of his campaigns in Palestine and Syria during the years 1917-1918. But older readers may be reminded, and new readers, who cannot fail to be many, may be informed of some of the qualities which have made this work a classic.

There is, first of all, its massive learning. This was already evident in the first edition, it is still more evident now; for, immersed as Principal Smith has been for over twenty years in the detail of academic administration, he has found time to keep abreast of the ever-accumulating results of archaeological investigation which is being conducted by the scholars of many lands. Ancient authorities on geography, mediæval pilgrimages, ancient, mediæval, and modern campaigns—all like are drawn into the sweep of his exposition, and the learning is worn so lightly and woven with such deftness into the narrative that it is easy to forget how vast and profound that learning is. Then there is the keen scientific observation attested by every page of the book, which recalls Dalman's 'Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina.' Dr. Smith has watched with the eyes not only of a poet and a pilgrim, but of a trained and acute observer, every detail and phenomenon of the land, and he has described it all with the vividness which must lay it close to the heart of the dulllest of readers. Nor can any one with an ear for the music of words be insensible to the exquisite literary charm which pervades the whole book and rises at points to heights of extraordinary beauty. Nothing could be finer of its kind than pages 95-97, where he speaks 'to quote only one of many golden sentences—of 'His awful last judgment, the morning scattered on the mountains, when the dawn is crushed upon the land between the hills and the heavy clouds, and the lurid light is spilt like the wine-press of the wrath of God.' And stly, you are made to feel the spiritual significance of the land, its contours and its scenery—that upon that small area was enacted the greatest of all historical and religious dramas. Apart from

its literary grace, the uniqueness of the book lies in its skilful interlacing of historical, geographical, and religious interests, or rather in the power with which it is shown that, in the nature of the case and in the purpose of God, these interests are inextricably interlaced.

This book is both old and new. A careful comparison of even the later editions with the last shows at numerous points how its original substance has been expanded, enriched, and brought right up to date. A chapter has been added on Edom, relevant and welcome in view of post-war political developments; this chapter would make a good basis for Professor G. L. Robinson's extended study in his 'Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization.' The book is supplied with eight admirable maps, which for clearness and accuracy leave nothing to be desired. The study of the people and the Book as well as of the land cannot fail to be fruitfully promoted by a volume which invests so wide a knowledge of all three with so persuasive a literary form.

#### OLD TESTAMENT TRANSLATIONS.

Two translations have reached us this month, both by competent scholars, but with very different aims. One is of Isaiah, entitled *The Prophetic Poetry of Isaiah, Chapters 1-37*, by Mr. William Popper (Cambridge University Press; 14s. net). The principle that governs this translation is that about 20 per cent. of the poetry of Isaiah, as we now have it, exhibits defective parallelism, and that these 'splashes of defectiveness,' which he thinks are not original, can by a skilful manipulation be made good and the original restored. Most of the changes which Mr. Popper has introduced into the text 'have been made in order to restore clarity of meaning on the basis of regularity of form.' It is unfortunate that the revised Hebrew text, by which these changes would be justified, has appeared separately in the University of California 'Publications in Semitic Philology,' vol. i.; had they been incorporated in the volume before us, we should have been better able to judge their value. As it is, we are obliged to estimate the translation independently on its merits; and, in its purely literary aspect, it cannot be said to be of startlingly noble quality, nor is it fitted to enhance our appreciation of Isaiah as a poet. In justice to Mr. Popper it must be said that he is quite aware of this. He frankly admits that he is 'perfectly conscious of the fact that because of his lack of the poet's gift this translation emphasizes

often the form at the expense of the spirit of the original.' There are in this version many obvious improvements, the textual basis of which is thoroughly familiar to scholars, as, for example, 'Thou hast multiplied their gladness and magnified their joy' (9<sup>3</sup>). There are other difficult passages in which he has scored a fair measure of success, as in the famous word-play in 7<sup>9</sup>, which he renders 'If your faith be not sure, then ye shall not endure.' But he has failed, as practically every one has failed—some even more terribly than he—to reproduce the subtle play in the sentence which closes the Song of the Vineyard (5<sup>7</sup>):

He hoped for the good,  
But behold, there is blood!  
And for the right,  
But behold, there is fright!

This is not quite good enough for Isaiah!

The other translation is of *The Book of Deuteronomy*, by Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D. (National Adult School Union; 1s. net). The translation is prefaced by a brief, but useful, Introduction, which places the book in its true historical setting as, generally speaking, a product of the seventh century B.C., and indicates the successive editorial processes to which it has been subjected. The translation itself has the merit of being thoroughly idiomatic; it reads like a piece of English, and does not suggest Hebrew idiom at all. Readers who may be offended by its colloquialisms must in fairness be reminded that it does not aim at fine writing; it is, what it was intended to be, a translation 'into colloquial English.' But one may reasonably raise the question whether this particular kind of colloquial English is at any time desirable. A translator has to remember the quality and atmosphere of his original, and to reproduce that, if he can: in particular he has to remember that this book is great oratory, and great oratory can be easily degraded when it is presented in a too jaunty and colloquial idiom. A few illustrations will make the point, if not convincing, at any rate clear. 'Off they went up to the hill country' (1<sup>24</sup>). 'We don't want to get killed' (5<sup>25</sup>). 'He'—i.e. Yahweh—'has stuck to you ever since' (10<sup>15</sup>). 'A country where you won't need to go on short rations, or do without anything' (8<sup>9</sup>). 'On the other hand, I am kind to any number of people, simply because they are connected with those who love Me and carry out My instructions' (5<sup>10</sup>). Dr. Cadoux seems to be particularly fond of the words 'mind' and 'start.' 'Mind you act just as your God Yahweh has

instructed you. Never take a different line' (5<sup>33</sup>). 'Do mind that you don't get taken in by the idea of copying them' (12<sup>30</sup>). 'Do not start longing for your neighbour's wife' (5<sup>21</sup>). 'I am starting to put Sihon and his country at your disposal. Make a start now to get hold of it' (2<sup>31</sup>). 'Do not start saying to yourselves,' etc. (8<sup>17</sup>). The deepest depths of this type of colloquialism are touched in the phrase which occurs in one of the noblest and most eloquent chapters, 'When you have eaten till you feel you've had enough' (8<sup>12</sup>). The poet, naturally fares no better, if even as well. Take for example, 32<sup>15</sup>:

And Jacob ate his fill;  
Jeshurun got fat and started kicking.  
You got fat: you thickened; you were gorged.

Translators who essay the perilous task of translation into colloquial English would do well to take to heart the reminder of Mr. Popper, that 'a translator, who in an attempt to make the English Version more intelligible to the masses, uses local colloquialisms, is false to the æsthetic spirit of this type of Semitic literature.'

The purely legal section of the book is much more satisfactory than the hortatory, where the inherent nobility of those great speeches has been dissipated beyond recognition. But readers who only desiderate an exact reproduction of every nuance of the sense of the book will certainly find it here.

#### THE CHURCH AND ENGLISH LIFE.

Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. have just published a volume of sermons by the Bishop of Norwich. Dr. Pollock has given them the general title *The Church and English Life*, because they deal with national aspects of the English Church with English education, and with doctrine and dogma, and with marriage ideals. Attention should be drawn to the prologue, in which he considers the future of the Church of England. There is a fear, he says, lest the special characteristics of the Church should be endangered by its becoming too much the Church of the clergy. It is the general sweetening of the conduct of the community by the Spirit of Christ which counts for most. We may dread, too, that the Church may become exclusive in its bearing towards those who have little or no contact with the Churches—the Church's own welcome must be wider than its own churchmanship. And we have to face the false but prevalent notion that we can have Christianity without Christ. Then the Church



has to reckon also with an outside weight of secularization, and also with the hesitation of lukewarm believers to make the ventures of faith. In the last place, he says there is no reason why we should consider the present post-war mentality as permanent. It need not always be the case that people should look upon every question as 'a problem.' It is one thing to welcome fresh light from every source, another to regard everything as an open question. In spiritual matters this attitude is against the spirit of the English Church and against the English mind, which is more practical and prefers rather to act on principles than to explore them.

We have given a considerable part of one of the sermons in 'The Christian Year' for this month. The footnotes to the sermon indicate which is the Bishop's treatment.

#### PROFESSOR PEAKE'S PLAIN THOUGHTS.

One of the most curious features of the theological world in our generation has been the appearance of certain eminent men who were at the same time thoroughly modern and 'critical' in their attitude to the Bible and intensely orthodox in their theology. A conspicuous example was Robertson Smith. An equally notable instance was Dr. Denney. And a third was Professor Peake. His critical standpoint can be gathered from 'Peake's Commentary,' as well as from his own works. It was decidedly liberal. His theological position is revealed in *Plain Thoughts on Great Subjects*, which has been edited by the Rev. Leslie S. Peake, M.A., B.Litt. (Allenson; 5s. net).

The book is a collection of essays contributed to various magazines, and of addresses delivered to various audiences. The theological part includes 'The Atonement of Jesus Christ,' 'The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit,' and 'The Hope of Immortality.' There are articles on Reunion, on Evangelism in our Age, on Religious Persecution. And finally there are some examples of purely expository work. It will interest many readers to know that Dr. Peake strongly upholds the Catholic faith in the Trinity with its Corollary in the Eternal Sonship of Christ, and that his view of the Atonement, while not purely substitutionary, does justice to the traditional elements and to the Scriptural view of sin. Dr. Peake sums up the truth in the word 'identification' in place of 'substitution.' As containing examples of Dr. Peake's general religious attitude, and specially as reflecting his mature Christian belief, this book will be valued by many.

#### FRANCE AND ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

In *The Civilization of France*, by Mr. Ernst Robert Curtius (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), we have what is intended to be an 'introduction' to the subject undertaken by its author at the wish of the publishers as a counterpart to the book on England by Dibelius. It is a comprehensive treatment of the whole subject in eight sections, admirably translated by Miss Olive Wyon. We are concerned here chiefly with the section on 'Religion,' which the reader will find a good test of the spirit and authority of the writer. He brings the treatment of the subject through all its varying phases up to date. 'As we study the religious situation in France at the present time,' he writes, 'the most important fact which emerges is this: there is a renaissance of Catholic faith and life, to an extent which would have been considered impossible twenty or thirty years ago.' There are Protestant churches in France, and from time to time individual Protestants have taken an effective part in the politics and the intellectual life of France, 'but in the religious struggles of modern France Protestantism means practically nothing.' He tells us that if we were to judge the religious situation in France by its political and intellectual manifestations alone there would seem to be a fight to the death between two hostile armies—the Sceptics and the Roman Catholic Church. In the give and take of everyday life, however, this fierce hostility seems to die down. Of Pascal's 'Pensées' he tells us that this classic of French literature has always found an echo in spiritual natures in other churches and other nations throughout the Christian world. One of the outstanding events of the present century was the passing of the law which decreed the separation between Church and State. He asserts that this has had a good effect on the religious forces of the country. 'It has spiritualized the religious ideal and made it more heroic. To the clergy it has brought an increase of moral energy and authority.' 'To-day French Catholicism numbers among its supporters and adherents a large élite in intellectuals in all professions, and it has a great following among the young. In literature also Catholics take a leading position.'

#### THE AMERICAN TRANSCENDENTALISTS.

*The Periodicals of American Transcendentalism* (Cambridge University Press; 20s. net) is a Columbia doctoral dissertation by Mr. Clarence

L. F. Gohdes, being a study of co-operative literary activity on the part of the religious, social, and literary radicals who were known in the America of their day as 'transcendentalists.' It was the religious question that bulked most largely in their writings. While on the negative side they reacted against conservative theology, on the positive side they were mystics and idealists. The earlier representatives of American transcendentalism were Dr. Channing, Emerson, Alcott, Brownson, Parker, and others. These were practically all Unitarians at one time or another. The later representatives, who regarded Unitarianism as too conservative in its theology, are not so well known on this side of the Atlantic, but they include Frothingham, who wrote the history of the transcendentalist movement in New England.

Those who are interested in the movement will find much information in Dr. Gohdes' pages, which appear to be as reliable as they are carefully documented, and which are often lively and entertaining. Indeed, his desire to entertain takes away from the value of the Introduction, which might have contained a firmer and more definite exposition of the principles of the Transcendentalists. But his accounts of their organs are very useful, and will serve to perpetuate the memory of a movement in American literature which might readily be forgotten. Were it to be forgotten among us, then the whole story of the influence of Thomas Carlyle or S. T. Coleridge, of Charles Fourier or Victor Cousin or Swedenborg, could not be told.

### THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

*Perfectionism*, vol. i. (Milford; 20s. net), is the seventh to appear of the projected ten volumes which are to include the numerous articles on theological subjects contributed by the late Professor Benjamin B. Warfield to encyclopædias, reviews, and other periodicals. The first five of the seven articles in this volume appeared in the 'Princeton Theological Review'; they deal with Albrecht Ritschl and his doctrine of Christian Perfection, and with 'Miserable-Sinner Christianity' in the hands of the Rationalists (1. from Ritschl to Wernle; 2. from Clemen to Pfeleiderer; 3. Windisch and the end).

As against Ritschl and the Rationalists, Dr. Warfield contends stoutly, with all his massive learning and critical acumen, for the Reformation

doctrine of sin and grace. Ritschl, as he says, represented Christians as working out religious and moral perfection for themselves without any help whatever from God. He was in express antagonism to the Reformation conception of 'the miserable sinner,' dismissing it with scorn. He even sought to deprive the Reformation doctrine of the support of Paul, to whose teaching it makes its chief appeal. And the Perfectionism of Ritschl and his successors received a scientific exegetical basis at the hands of Windisch and others, or at any rate was thought to have received such. But, according to Dr. Warfield, the most striking thing about the long-continued attempt to prove that Paul regarded the Christian as a sinless man is the clearness with which it has come out that Paul knows nothing whatsoever of a sinless man in this life.

The sixth article, reprinted from 'Bibliotheca Sacra,' expounds 'Die Heiligungsbewegung' (the Sanctification Movement), commonly spoken of as 'The Fellowship Movement,' that remarkable lay-movement in Germany which seeks to create, as it would say, a true and living Church of God within the dead and dry shell of the National Churches of the several German States. It may be regarded as the German parallel to the 'Keswick Movement' in English-speaking lands.

The seventh article, reprinted from the 'Biblical Review,' pursues the same theme and discusses in particular the German Higher Life Movement as represented by the teaching of Theodor Jellinghaus, whose work on salvation through Christ—containing a moderate Perfectionist doctrine—became the text-book of the Movement. But with the doctrine of Perfectionism in any form Dr. Warfield will have no traffic.

*Angelus Silesius*, by Mr. J. E. Crawford Flitch (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net), is a book which will delight those who are interested in the by-paths of mysticism. The writer has given here the first full account in English of the seventeenth-century poet and mystic, whose real name was Johann Scheffler. The second part of the book contains a number of selections translated from 'The Cherubinic Wanderer,' the work in which Angelus Silesius set forth his thoughts on moral and religious topics in aphoristic form. It can hardly be said that the somewhat strained paradoxes of Silesius will appeal to the general reader.

Mr. Clifford Allen, a former chairman of the



Independent Labour Party, has lost no time in publishing a sweeping indictment of the action of the majority section of the Labour Party during the recent crisis in a volume of less than a hundred pages entitled *Labour's Future at Stake* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). He believes that the Labour Movement has 'the finest programme of ideas and the most splendid rank and file of any party in the world,' and yet from his intimate personal knowledge he declares that it suffers from 'more personal hatred and dislikes among its leaders, young and old, trade union and political, than any other party,' and that 'this factor was amongst the most important in determining the policies it so unwisely pursued during the recent crisis.' It can hardly be doubted that the majority section will have ample time in which to consider this situation both inside and outside the House of Commons, but Mr. Allen insists that either the vendetta against Mr. MacDonald must cease and the Party be reunited or there is no future for it.

There are increasing evidences that the current theory of organic evolution needs to be thoroughly overhauled. Attention has been generally concentrated on facts which confirm the theory, and other equally significant facts have been quietly ignored. Then, again, hypotheses built upon observed facts have continued to be uncritically accepted in spite of a growingly manifest need of revision. In *Man and Animal*, by Mr. Hermann Poppelbaum, Ph.D. (Anthroposophical Publishing Co.; 7s. 6d. net), the whole subject is surveyed from an unusual angle. The writer's theory of physical evolution is that the main stem of the great tree of organic life is, from the first, the human, away from which the various animal forms have at different stages diverged into a fixed degeneracy. A very respectable amount of evidence is brought in support of this view. When, however, in dealing with the spirit forces controlling organic evolution the writer follows the 'sensible-supersensible vision' of Dr. Rudolf Steiner he enters a region where few will follow him with any confidence. The book, however, is highly suggestive, if for nothing else than that it shows convincingly that the mystery of man's origin and destiny is not to be solved by any merely mechanical theory of evolution.

Professor Robert Pierce Casey, Ph.D., of the University of Cincinnati, has edited the original Greek text of *Serapion of Thmuis against the Manichees* (Cambridge University Press; 8s. 6d.

net). The work is obviously from a scholar's hands, and students of Greek Patristic literature owe Dr. Casey a debt of gratitude. The text is prefaced by a valuable Introduction, in which, after a short account of the manuscripts of Serapion's 'Adversus Manichaeos,' the editor tells us what is known of Serapion, discusses the genuineness of the writings ascribed to him, and offers an estimate of the work against the Manichees. It would appear that Serapion was content with the most meagre information about his opponents; and that he launches a general attack on dualism, developing it in detail by a series of supposititious claims and objections. In both these respects he may be contrasted with St. Augustine. Perhaps the most interesting portions of Serapion's work are those which enable us to form some idea of his own opinions; and it is particularly noteworthy that, in spite of his friendship with Athanasius and his hostility to Arianism, he does not here commit himself to the Nicene terminology.

We have received the popular 'C.M.S. Story for 1931' issued under the title of *Weapons that Win*, by Mr. E. F. E. Wigram, M.A. (Church Missionary Society; 1s. net). It is, as usual, admirably done, brief yet vivid, a rapid panorama of lands and peoples, with inspiring glimpses of heroic labours and gospel triumphs. The sections on India and China are specially illuminating, and should interest even those who are not keenly missionary in spirit. It is most heartening to see how the work of the Kingdom goes forward in spite of the world-wide upheaval of our time.

On the basis of a study of eleven MSS, most of them Bodleian, Dr. Abraham J. Levy presents the text of *Rashi's Commentary on Ezekiel 40-48*, with an introductory discussion dealing with the sources of error in the printed texts and with the grouping of the manuscripts, of which he offers a description, indicating their characteristic features ( Dropsie College, Philadelphia; \$2.00). The chapters selected are not exactly the most interesting in Ezekiel, but their very difficulties offer fine scope for such a mind as Rashi's, and for the student of Rashi there is the additional interest that his own text is in a corrupt state; it had been submitted by himself to repeated revisions, to say nothing of later and foreign additions. It is no easy matter to clear the original of its embellishments. This is part of the task which Dr. Levy has set himself, and he has accomplished it with the care of a sound scholar.

We had the pleasure recently of reviewing 'The Epistles of the Sundays and Festivals,' by the late Rev. Cornelius J. Canon Ryan, D.D., of the Metropolitan Chapter of Dublin. We have now received a copy of the earlier work by which his reputation was gained, *The Gospels of the Sundays and Festivals* (Gill & Sons, Dublin; 2 vols., 2rs. net). This work, which is said to be found on the bookshelves of English-speaking priests the world over, was first published nearly thirty years ago, and is now in its ninth edition. It is intended as an aid to the ecclesiastical student or the missionary priest in his preparation for the duty of explaining the Sacred Scriptures for the people. The whole work reflects a close study of the early Fathers, of Catholic commentators ancient and modern, and of lexicographers, grammarians, and Biblical archaeologists. Nor has the author confined his studies to Catholic writers. And Protestants will fully sympathize with his contention that in any exposition of the Gospels worthy of the name a frequent reference to the original Greek text is not only useful but necessary.

Accurate knowledge of the past must necessarily rest upon minute and laborious study. Some of the abundant material scattered in various libraries which goes to illustrate the kaleidoscopic life of the Jews in the Middle Ages has been collected by Professor Jacob Mann, M.A., Litt.D., in a sumptuous volume of seven hundred and twenty-eight pages entitled *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature*, i. (Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati). The volume contains documents concerning European Jewry, which illustrate the practical interest of Hisdai Ibn Shaprūt, the prominent Jewish statesman of Cordova, in the welfare of the Jews of Spain and other European countries; letters of the Babylonian Geonim, which throw interesting light on the internal conditions prevailing in the academies in the tenth and eleventh centuries; letters dealing with Palestinian affairs in the eleventh century, and legal documents affecting Egyptian affairs and personalities between the tenth and the fifteenth centuries; documents concerning the Jews in Mosul and Kurdistan, of whom hitherto very little has been known; fragments of legalistic writings of the Gaonic period; and finally, Genizah inventories of books.

Dr. Mann presents the Hebrew text of all these letters and documents, many of which have never been published before, and he prefaces each section with an elaborate introduction which deals inti-

mately and helpfully with their contents. Besides throwing light on obscure periods and personalities this volume incidentally corrects some prevalent misapprehensions, as, for example, that the Babylonian Gaonate ended with the death of Hai in 1038. In point of fact, 'the 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries are still a period of considerable intellectual activity in the Orient in the field of Rabbinic poetry, Biblical exegesis and other branches of Jewish and general learning. And the Baghdad schools still wielded their influence on the Oriental communities in maintaining the tradition of Rabbinic Judaism.' The book is adorned with twenty-seven beautifully executed facsimiles of letters, documents, and signatures.

It was high time that we had a readable biography of Vanderkemp the pioneer missionary of South Africa. The blank has now been filled by a modest but well-packed volume entitled *Doctor Vanderkemp*, by the Rev. A. D. Martin (Livingstone Press). It is the romantic life story of a high-spirited Dutch army officer who gave up at once a life of sin and a promising army career for the love of a humble and virtuous girl; who, thereafter qualified as a doctor of medicine in Edinburgh, and finally, at the age of fifty, went out to the Cape as a missionary and gave his life to evangelize and champion the down-trodden Hottentots. Mr. Martin reveals sympathetically the story of Vanderkemp's spiritual life, and throws much light upon the distracted state of South Africa during the years of the Napoleonic wars.

An exposition of the messages to the Seven Churches of Revelation is contained in *A Word to the Angels*, by the Rev. H. J. Dale, the Baptist minister of Lymington (Stanley Martin; 1rs. net). It is a pleasant little book which will remind its readers of discourses they listened to with interest and profit.

Within the short compass of one hundred and ninety-two pages, Miss B. K. Rattey, S.Th., Divinity Mistress of King Edward's High School for Girls, Birmingham, has contrived to write an admirable *Short History of the Hebrews* (Milford; 2s. 9d. net), which skilfully combines comprehensiveness with brevity. After introductory chapters on the growth of the Old Testament and on the land and people, she carries the story from the days of Moses right on to the death of Herod, and ends with an illuminating chapter on the progressive character of Hebrew religion. The sketch rests on a thorough



acquaintance with the sources and their value as determined by literary criticism, and the whole treatment, while 'edifying' in the best sense of that much abused word, is refreshingly modern. Miraculous tales are touched with delicacy and insight and in a way that will offend neither the modern mind nor conservative prejudice. The two accounts of the origin of the monarchy and of David's introduction to Saul are frankly set forth; in the treatment of such duplicates and of tales like that of Uzzah's death we recognize the sure touch of the wise teacher, who can present her interpretations persuasively, and who knows the things to emphasize. The broad outlines of the history stand out clear, while prophecy, and even apocalyptic, are not forgotten. This vivid and careful sketch is usefully supplemented by over forty excellent illustrations of many kinds—landscapes, inscriptions, and other objects and people of interest, ancient and modern.

It should be noted that the Oxford University Press have published a second edition of *Helps to the Study of the Bible*. The price is only 8s. 6d. net. This new edition contains a number of corrections, alterations, and additions.

An excellent collection of hymns for children's worship has been made in *The Young People's Hymnal* (Pickering & Inglis; 3s. in cloth limp, and 3d. in manilla covers, the former with music). We are not informed who made the selection, but we notice all the old favourites, with a large number of new additions. It is pleasant to find in the case of 'All Hail the Power' both the familiar tune and that which became popular during the 'Welsh Revival.' The hymns are arranged in a fashion to make them readily usable, and there is a number of choruses included at the end. This book should prove of great value in Sunday schools and day schools, as well as in the home.

What is termed a Centenary volume, because it contains the names of one hundred notables with accompanying photographs, has been published under the title *Chief Men among the Brethren* (Pickering & Inglis; 3s. 6d. net). It contains brief biographies, compiled by Mr. Henry Pickering, of outstanding men among those generally known as Plymouth Brethren; but it is pointed out that the first public room where those known as the 'Brethren' met was in Dublin, not Plymouth. The most widely known was George Müller, by birth a Prussian, who came to this country and

settled in Bristol. There he started the work for the care of destitute orphans, which made him famous as the philanthropist who trusted in God alone for the funds to carry on five orphanages, with accommodation for two thousand and fifty orphans and their large staffs. This needed a yearly income of about £30,000, and although sometimes reduced to the last coin, yet his faith in prayer never wavered, and during the long period of sixty-five years the necessary money was never lacking. It is stated that the money for the orphans that passed through his hands in answer to prayer considerably exceeded a million, and that he received similarly about £397,000 for circulating Bibles and tracts and aiding missions. What would George Müller have thought of so-called 'Hospital Sweepstakes'? Even during the present century there have been more than forty notables among 'the Brethren,' all of them men of education. There is no record of any woman.

Many British students have made good use of the Nestle text of the Greek Testament, and for some time now an edition prepared by Dr. Nestle's son, Dr. Erwin Nestle, has been available—*Novum Testamentum Graece* (Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart). A new edition, the fifteenth, has now been issued, printed with wide margins on excellent paper, and supplied with an English translation of the Introduction, which hitherto has been given only in German and Latin. In spite of the adverse exchange rate, the price—Mk. 4—is astonishingly low, and both the publishers and the editor are to be congratulated on putting this fine edition within the reach of all. The Greek text is a resultant text, based on a majority agreement of the readings preferred by Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and B. Weiss. In 1904 this text was taken over by the British and Foreign Bible Society in place of the Textus Receptus; but further improvements have been made, and a special feature of the new edition is the provision of a full critical apparatus. An ingenious but simple system of signs, fully explained in the Introduction, makes the various readings easy to follow. Handsomely bound, the work is a delight to handle, and its wide margins leave abundant room for the student's notes and comments.

Another book on the Pastoral Epistles has been written by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Boyd Vincent, D.D., *The Pastoral Epistles for To-day*, a Handbook for Students and Clergymen (Skeffington; 3s. 6d. net). There is nothing very new in this book. It takes

the Pauline authorship for granted, and goes over the text paragraph by paragraph, bringing out the significance of the teaching for our day, and especially for the clergy of our day. A good deal of work has been put into the book, and a good deal of experience lies behind its wise counsels.

*The Romance of Death*, by the Rev. Canon Spencer H. Elliott (S.P.C.K. ; 1s. net), is an attractive little book with much in it that is beautiful and true. By way of meeting difficulties the writer has some suggestive things to say about the mystery of the subconscious mind and the possibilities which might be wrapped up in a five-dimensional world. Passing from these considerations, he gives a short but very sane and comforting exposition of the teaching of the New Testament in regard to the Resurrection and the life to come.

*Essentials of Faith and Prayer*, by the Rev. J. B. Lancelot, M.A. (S.P.C.K. ; 3s. 6d. net), is in two parts, the first consisting of six addresses on the main articles of the Creed, the second consisting of eight addresses on the petitions of the Lord's Prayer. These addresses are simple, straightforward, and popular in form, designed to aid young people who may be vaguely groping for some firm ground of faith. They are full of wise Christian teaching, persuasively expressed.

How much harm is done by bad delivery in the pulpit, by bad articulation, by the clerical voice, by wrong pronunciations and all the other pulpit faults, it would be difficult to measure. We have all heard, or rather failed to hear, preachers who would be great preachers if only people could grasp what they were saying! And we have all been irritated by uncultured pronunciations which might be cured by a little research in a dictionary. The ordinary college does not pay enough attention to such matters. They could be set right by careful training. In default of that an attempt is made in *The Local Preachers' Efficiency Course*, by Mr. James W. Whittome (Stockwell ; 5s. net). This is one of the most really intelligent and useful books we have come across for a long time. There is nothing vague or merely general about it. It is a course of thorough training in twenty lessons. And these lessons include breathing exercises, vocal exercises, times of meditation on definite themes, a regular time of auto-suggestion, and the drastic treatment of ordinary pulpit faults. Every aspect of the preacher's outfit is dealt with, not only the technical but the spiritual. It would be

of untold benefit to many confirmed sinners, but we specially commend it to beginners. If they have any humility or teachableness they could not fail to profit.

In *The Absurdity of Christianity* (S.C.M. ; 1s. net) Professor Bowman of Glasgow University publishes, in a more elaborate form, the substance of an address delivered to the students of his University at the opening of their 'Religion and Life Week' in February of last year. His text is Tertullian's famous saying : 'Credibile est quia ineptum est ; certum est, quia impossibile est—Credo quia absurdum.' Of course, Professor Bowman does not really say all this literally. What he does is to show in what ways Christianity seems absurd to the 'modern' mind, and appears to have no real place in the life of the modern world, and then to show how reasonably and inevitably true it is in face of such a challenge. Those who know Professor Bowman's great reputation will need no assurance as to the suggestiveness and ability of this piece of apologetic. Those who do not know of the Professor of Moral Philosophy at Glasgow should buy this little book and make his acquaintance.

Volume xi. of *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, edited by Professor H. J. Cadbury (Yale University Press), is interesting alike to the archæologist, the philologist, and the historian. It contains an account of the 1930 spring and autumn campaigns of excavation at Jerash (Gerasa) by Dr. C. S. Fisher and Dr. C. C. McCown, and of the autumn campaign in 1931 by Dr. C. S. Fisher. Jerash is a site of peculiar importance, as it is perhaps the best preserved provincial city of the Roman Empire to be found in the area which Rome captured from Semitic-speaking peoples. Six strata of occupation have been disclosed, one Arab, two Byzantine, two Roman, and one Hellenistic. A special section is devoted to the Temple of Artemis, and accounts are given of the finds of pottery, lamps, jars, pots, tombs, inscriptions. The nature of the work and the value of the discoveries are vividly illustrated by splendidly executed photographs of the Temple, the Baths of Placcus, and the various finds. Assyriologists will be interested in the very careful and exhaustive study by Professor S. N. Kramer of 'The Verb in the Kirkuk Tablets,' whose aim is in part to differentiate between the Middle Babylonian represented by the extant Kirkuk texts and the Middle Assyrian as represented by



the Assyrian Law-book, both, it seems, approximately about the middle of the second millennium B.C. Professor W. R. Taylor, of Toronto, presents the Syriac text, with translation, of a colophon to a gospel-lectionary which he was permitted to examine in the Convent of St. Mark at Jerusalem. This is of exceptional interest, as it gives a very vivid picture of the distress in Jerusalem in 1149, which marked a turning-point in the history of the Crusades, and is of considerable value to the historian as throwing light on the critical events of the Second Crusade.

LIST OF PUBLISHERS.<sup>1</sup>

- Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York.  
 Philip Allan & Co. Ltd., 69 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1.  
 Allen & Unwin Ltd., 40 Museum Street, London, W.C.1.  
 H. R. Allenson Ltd., 7 Racquet Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.  
 Ernest Benn Ltd., Bouverie House, 154-160 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.  
 A. & C. Black Ltd., 4-6 Soho Square, London, W.1.  
 B. H. Blackwell Ltd., 50-51 Broad Street, Oxford.  
 Bloch Publishing Co., 31 West 31st Street, New York.  
 Burns, Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 43-45 Newgate Street, London, E.C.1.  
 Cambridge University Press, 133-137 Fetter Lane, London, E.C.4.  
 Carey Press, 19 Furnival Street, Holborn, London, E.C.4.  
 Cassell & Co. Ltd., La Belle Sauvage, Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.4.  
 Central Publishing House, 2969-75 West 25th Street, Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A.  
 Christian Endeavour Bookroom, 56 Old Bailey, London, E.C.4.  
 Christian Literature Society for India, Madras, India.  
 Church Missionary Society, 6 Salisbury Square, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.  
 Church of Scotland Committee on Youth, 22 Queen Street, Edinburgh.  
 T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh.  
 James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 9 Essex Street, Ldn. W.C.2.  
 Constable & Co. Ltd., 10-12 Orange Street, Leicester Square, London, W.C.2.  
 Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd., 6 Buckingham Gate, London, S.W.1.  
 J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 10-13 Bedford St. Ldn. W.C.2.  
 Edinburgh House Press, 2 Eaton Gate, London, S.W.1.  
 Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1.  
 Eyre & Spottiswoode Ltd., 6 Great New St. Ldn. E.C.4.  
 Faber & Faber Ltd., 24 Russell Sq. London, W.C.1.  
 Favil Press, 152 Church St. Kensington, London, W.8.  
 Harper & Brothers, 90 Gt. Russell St. London, W.C.1.  
 Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.  
 Heffer & Sons Ltd., 4 Petty Cury, Cambridge.  
 William Heinemann Ltd., 99 Gt. Russell St. Ldn. W.C.1.  
 Hodder & Stoughton, St. Paul's House, Warwick Square, London, E.C.4.  
 Holborn Publishing House, Holborn Hall, Clerkenwell Road, London, E.C.1.  
 Henry Holt & Co., 1 Park Avenue, New York.  
 Gerald Howe Ltd., 23 Soho Square, London, W.1.  
 Hunter & Longhurst Ltd., 9 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4.  
 Kingsgate Press, 4 Southampton Row, London, W.C.1.  
 John Lane, The Bodley Head, Ltd., Vigo St. Ldn. W.1.  
 Lindsey Press, 5 Essex Street, Strand, London, W.C.2.  
 Longmans, Green & Co., 38-41 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4.  
 Sampson Low, Marston & Co. Ltd., 100 Southwark Street, London, S.E.1.  
 Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 10-15 St. Martin's Street, Leicester Square, London, W.C.2.  
 Marshall, Morgan & Scott Ltd., 1-12 Paternoster Buildings, London, E.C.4.  
 Marshall Press Ltd., Milford Lane, London, W.C.2.  
 Stanley Martin & Co. Ltd., 2 Amen Corner, London, E.C.4.  
 Methodist Book Concern, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York.  
 Methuen & Co. Ltd., 36 Essex Street, Strand, Ldn. W.C.2.  
 Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C.4.  
 A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 27-28 Margaret St. Ldn. W.1.  
 John Murray, 50 Albemarle Street, London, W.1.  
 National Sunday School Union, 57-59 Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.4.  
 T. Nelson & Sons Ltd., 35-36 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4.  
 Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 22 Berners Street, London, W.1.  
 Oliphants Ltd., 75 Princes Street, Edinburgh.  
 Oliver & Boyd, Tweeddale Court, High St. Edinburgh.  
 Pickering & Inglis, 14 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4.  
 Putnam's Sons Ltd., 24 Bedford Street, London, W.C.2.  
 Bernard Quaritch Ltd., 11 Grafton Street, London, W.1.  
 Religious Tract Society, 4 Bouverie St. London, E.C.4.  
 Ryerson Press, 299 Queen St. West, Toronto, Canada.  
 Sands & Co., 37 George Street, Edinburgh.  
 Charles Scribner's Sons, 23 Bedford Square, Ldn. W.C.1.  
 Seeley, Service & Co. Ltd., 196 Shaftesbury Avenue, London, W.C.2.  
 Simpkin, Marshall Ltd., 4 Stationers' Hall Court, London, E.C.4.  
 Skeffington & Son Ltd., 34 Paternoster Row, Ldn. E.C.4.  
 S.P.C.K., 9 Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2.  
 Elliot Stock, 7 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4.  
 A. H. Stockwell Ltd., 29 Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.4.  
 Stratford Co., Boston, Mass., U.S.A.  
 Student Christian Movement, 56-58 Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1.  
 Williams & Norgate Ltd., 38 Gt. Ormond St. Ldn. W.C.1.

<sup>1</sup> Printed at the request of foreign and home readers.

# The Barthian School.

## I.

### An Appreciation.

BY THE REVEREND J. H. MORRISON, M.A., BUCKSBURN, ABERDEEN.

THE Barthian School consists of a group of Protestant theologians on the Continent whose acknowledged leader is Karl Barth, and who are in general agreement in expounding a system of Christian thought commonly known as 'The Theology of Crisis' or 'The Dialectic Theology.' While not denying the fitness of these names, Brunner says: 'Neither Barth, nor I, nor any other member of the group has conferred on it these titles. Our only possible name for it would be "The Theology of the Bible" or "Christian Theology."' There has been some discussion as to the best name under which to commend the system to the Christian mind of our country. It would not be inappropriate to call it 'The Theology of the Word.'

Among the leaders of the group may be mentioned Friedrich Gogarten, now Professor of Theology in Breslau, a man of great intellectual power, who reached the same general position as Barth along lines of his own, and may, in fact, be fitly claimed as the co-founder of the school; Dr. Edward Thurneysen, pastor of the Münster in Bâle, who in early days was Barth's near neighbour and joined with him in publishing a volume of sermons; and Professor Rudolf Bultmann of Marburg, a radical critic who has been captivated by Barth's teaching. The two best known in this country, however, are Barth himself and Emil Brunner. They are of strikingly different temperament. Barth, though born in Bâle, was brought up in Berne, while Brunner is of Zurich. The Swiss mark a contrast between these two towns in the pronunciation of their names, saying 'Ba-arn, Ba-arn (slow and deliberate), but Zurich, Zurich (swift, impulsive).' This contrast applies to these two men. Brunner is inclined to push his dialectic through to a clear-cut issue. This makes him greatly more readable than Barth, yet it is universally felt that Barth, with all the abruptness and obscurity of his style, is the real leader of the group. He is in many respects a Luther-like man. Dr. McConnachie, who probably knows him more intimately than any other in this country, describes him as 'a man of impressive personality, volcanic energy, with a keen dialectic mind, a reverent uplook, and a

delightful sense of humour.' His work has created a profound impression on the Continent, where half the German students of theology are said to be among his followers. The fact has been emphasized, and should be borne in mind, that Barth, still a comparatively young man of forty-five, has modified, and may be expected further to modify, his views, so that minute criticism of his terminology and early writings, for example, the first edition of his *Romans*, becomes somewhat profitless. It cannot be doubted, however, that he is a man with a vital message, and the advent of his School has been hailed as holding the promise of the rebirth of Protestantism.

The theology of the Barthian School bears the impress of the agony of the World War, and some are repelled by what they feel to be a lack of sanity, balance, and philosophic calm. To which Barth might well reply that the Apostles and Prophets lived in times of stress and storm, and saw in the tremendous events of their day the tokens of still more tremendous things. All great revelations have come through blood and tears, and the abstract thinker or the student sitting at his ease is perhaps the last person in the world to interpret them.

The Barthian message might be read as a vigorous, even exultant, commentary on the passage in 1 Corinthians where St. Paul glories in the foolishness of the preaching of the Cross, declaring that God has made foolish the wisdom of the world, and has chosen the weak things of the world to confound the wise, that no flesh should glory in His presence. It is a tremendous onslaught on the modern world-spirit by men whose whole souls are captivated by the Word of God. 'Our time,' says Brunner, 'which has made unparalleled progress in scientific knowledge, is perhaps further away from truth than any previous age.' Again, 'Modern thinking expresses a new interpretation of human experience, and one which is as irreconcilably opposed to that found in the Bible and in Christian teaching as were the Baals, against which the prophet Elijah fought, to the God of Israel.' According to Barth, all the activities of man, his achievements



and triumphs, even his highest spiritual achievements, are so many towers of Babel of man's building, and worthless in God's sight. This is a challenge indeed, but it is powerfully supported and pressed home. 'Ye shall be as gods,' said the tempter, and this desire to 'be as God,' self-sufficient and with a wisdom all his own, has ever been man's snare. He has gone to work without dependence on God, but trusting in his own 'arm of flesh.' Brunner sees in Modernism 'a reprimatization of later Platonism,' the fundamental idea of which is that 'man in the depths of his being is Divine; Divine in the sense that the consciousness of the best and highest in human nature constitutes also the consciousness of the eternally Divine. The nurture of the highest in us frees us from the disharmony and slavery which cling, as so-called sin, to the finite.' This amounts to saying that man is his own saviour, and that God is at best the ideal companion. The modern form of this spirit has allied itself with a doctrine of natural evolution according to which the race is steadily rising in the scale of being and working out its own salvation. The fatal error of all this is that man proudly occupies the centre of the stage, and in effect deifies himself instead of humbly trusting in higher help. What is this but a reincarnation of the Titans, a rebuilding of the Tower of Babel on a grander scale?

The Church itself is not free from this spirit, but, on the contrary, according to the Barthians, is corrupted and enslaved by it. 'The evil lies here,' says Brunner, 'that recent theology has been much more affected by modern than by Biblical thought, and that so-called Christian theology conceals under Christian phraseology an idealism, mysticism, or moralism which stands to Christian thought proper in a mutually exclusive relation of Either-Or, and, so far as its bearing on reality is concerned, is a self-delusion on man's part. Such theology—even where there is no conscious intention—must, in the long run, simply destroy the Church of Christ.' Much that is taught under the name of Christian theology ought rather to be called the science of religion. It is not specifically Christian, for Christianity is either faith in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ or it is nothing. So the Barthian School summons the Church to 'take theology in its original sense as the methodical study of the meaning of the Word of God.'

Historically it is of interest to note how this viewpoint was reached. It was when Barth was faced with the practical problems of the pulpit that he began to discover the inadequacy of his theology.

He found he had no message for his people until his eyes were opened to what he calls 'the strange new world within the Bible.' There he found men with an intent upward look, as if they had been arrested on the spot and stood there with strained attention, absorbed in the eternal. 'Always there is the same seeing of the invisible, the same hearing of the inaudible, the same incomprehensible but not less undeniable epidemic of standing still and looking up.' One explanation alone is adequate. God is speaking to these men; the Eternal has broken in upon them. And so, when they in turn speak to their fellows, it is not their own word they speak but God's. This has ever been the Church's faith. Everything which the Apostles, the great Church fathers, and the creeds 'wanted to express is this one thing: that into the world of men with their ethics, their metaphysics, and their religions, there has entered something different, something which is distinguished not gradually or quantitatively, but qualitatively and fundamentally, from everything which man can know from himself outward. And that something is the Word of God. If it could be shown that this opinion was an illusion, that Christian faith is only a modification of general religious or metaphysical knowledge . . . this would mean nothing less than that the Christian faith is an illusion, for the central thesis of Christian faith would be destroyed.' These are rousing words, but it can hardly be denied that they are timely, and urgently needing to be spoken. For have not the Protestant Churches grown pale and anæmic poring over critical commentaries and Biblical theologies which analyse the sources and set Paul's opinion over against Peter's, and pass judgment upon them all in a cool unimpassioned way: from the superior standpoint of modern thought? It was time the futility of this were plainly declared. Does the Christian preacher go into the pulpit to give instruction in Biblical history or antiquities, or even ethics and religion, or any other branch of human knowledge? The vital question is, has he, or has he not, a Word of God to speak to the people? By that alone must he be judged, and by that alone the Church must stand or fall.

It must not be supposed, however, that the Barthian School is fundamentalist. Far from it. Barth fully recognizes the right of criticism. He speaks of the Bible as 'a human document like any other, which can lay no *a priori* dogmatic claim to special attention and consideration.' This, he thinks, may be taken for granted to-day. 'We need not continue trying to break through an open

door.' But he emphasizes that 'intelligent and fruitful discussion of the Bible begins when the judgment as to its human, its historical, and psychological character has been made and *put behind us*.' He is impatient to get on to the one thing that matters, 'the special *content* of this human document, the remarkable *something* with which the writers of these stories and those who stood behind them were concerned, the Biblical *content*.' To him this is in the most real sense a revelation, an *ingressio*, a breaking in of the Divine.

Neither Barth nor Gogarten has reached finality in his theological thinking. Both, be it remembered, are men in the full vigour of the middle forties and may yet go far. A completed system of Barthian theology would therefore be premature, but some brief outline may be given of the leading tenets of the School.

First, in their doctrine of God the Divine transcendence and sovereignty are emphasized in a way that is startling to a generation accustomed to dwell somewhat exclusively on immanence and fatherhood. The Barthian expression, *totaliter aliter*, has been much criticised and, let it be added, much misunderstood. Barth does not mean to deny the immanence of God. Brunner speaks of the 'much nonsense' which has been talked about that. Nor does he deny that man is made in the image of God. On the contrary, he bases on that the possibility of the Incarnation. The *totaliter aliter* is a bolt aimed at the current conception that God is to be found in man's soul, is the personification of his ideals. It is a distinction of personality which Barth is safeguarding. He is emphatic that God can never be known except as a distinct person 'I,' over against man as 'thou.' God is never simply an object of thought, but the living God with whom we have to do. This is not to deny His fatherhood. On the contrary, the highest expression which the Bible gives of the utter difference between God and man is in its teaching of the forgiveness of sins. Rightly understood, the *totaliter aliter* is a wholesome and timely protest against the modern tendency to raise man to the level of the Divine and ignore the gulf that lies between.

The Barthian doctrine of man is equally unpalatable to the modern mind. It pours contempt on all man's pride. The gravest stress is laid on sin as that which separates man from God. 'Over against man's confidence and belief in himself, there has been written, in huge proportions and with utmost clearness, a *mene, mene, tekel*.' Sin

does not merely cling to man's heart like the barnacles to the ship's hull. It is rooted in man's heart and cannot be outgrown. The Barthian teaching is here thoroughly Calvinistic and Pauline. Expressions like 'original sin' and 'total depravity' have never been intended to imply that all men are black alike and that every sinner is a devil. Perhaps the most eloquent passage ever written in warm and grateful appreciation of man's natural powers and virtues is to be found in Calvin's *Institutes*. But such natural powers and virtues are utterly inadequate to meet man's need when he faces face to face with God. They may, on the contrary, become an obstacle to man's appreciation of his real position, which is one of complete helplessness.

It is to man the sinner in such desperate plight that the Word of God comes. And that Word of God is perfectly embodied in Jesus Christ, in whom the Eternal breaks into this world of time, for He is God manifest in the flesh. Human language breaks down in the attempt to express the wonder of this revelation. Barth, like Samuel Rutherford, is at his best when his theme is Jesus Christ. This meeting-place of the Word of God and sinful man is the occasion of a crisis. This is one of the ruling conceptions of the Barthian theology. The word has received a number of definitions, some of them more epigrammatical than illuminating. But the main idea is clear enough. The sinner, face to face with the Word, is brought to a stand and to a turning-point. He cannot get away from it, he must decide, for better or for worse, and the consequences of his decision are eternal. It is in this connexion especially that the Barthians make use of the phrase 'existential thinking.' By that is meant the thinking of a man who realizes that his very existence is at stake. It is contrasted with theoretic thinking, where the thinker looks on as a spectator viewing a *θέατρον* in which he personally is not an antagonist. Much religious thinking is of this type, done with cool scientific objectivity, and a serene æsthetic outlook upon the world, never with the passion of a drowning man who desperately cries for help. When St. Peter concluded the first Christian sermon at Pentecost his hearers 'were cut to the heart, and said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"' That is the point to which the Word of God designs to bring us all, and show of which all our knowledge is of no saving account whatever. The Word comes in historic form, but it is not received upon historic evidence, even the strongest. It carries its own trustworthiness within itself. It is, as Calvin expresses it, *autopistic*. 'Believe I *must* in His own Word alone



says Brunner, 'and believe I *can* only because and when He speaks His own Word within me through His Holy Spirit.'

The Barthian eschatology is extremely characteristic and illuminating, though here Gogarten holds position of his own. If Gladstone, as Morley says, slept and woke with the thought of the universe, it may be said of Barth that he sleeps and wakes with the thought of the eternal. In his respect the Barthians have caught the spirit of the Apostles and Prophets and of all the Biblical writers who are absorbed in the feeling that the eternal overshadows them and is continually breaking in upon them. The coming of the Kingdom is for ever imminent. A vast amount of painfully prosaic stuff has been written in our time about the mistake of the Apostles in supposing that the advent was near, that is, a matter of a few months or years. As if Paul did not warn the Thessalonians against that very error, and as if Peter (or some other wise Christian in his name) did not warn the Apostolic Church that 'a day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.' That is not rhetoric, but profound spiritual truth to be spiritually discerned. It is not a question of days and years. Brunner maintains that in eschatological thinking there is an intensive magnitude which attaches to what he calls 'time of crisis,' which is not 'thing-time,' *i.e.* the mathematical time of hours and calendars, but is incommensurable with it. Paul would never have dreamed of saying, 'Isaiah thought the day of the Lord at hand, but he was eight hundred years out in his reckoning.' He must have understood nearness in some sense which did not falsify the expectations of the Prophets, and without doubt he would have said to the twentieth century what he said to the first, 'The Lord is at hand.' All expressions of magnitude and distance are relative, and must be understood in their proper connexions. It is permitted to a modern scientist to remark

that man has but 'recently' appeared on the earth, though by 'recently' he means three hundred thousand years ago, because those three hundred thousand years are dwarfed in comparison with the immensities of sidereal time. But, when an Apostle speaks of 'soon,' he must forsooth be tied down to a few months or years, although he is obviously speaking of time in relation to eternity. Brunner's remark is worth pondering, that 'where God is truly known, the "soon" coming of the Kingdom is known also.'

It is not difficult to recognize in the teaching of the Barthian School many authentic notes of the old Reformation theology, from which the Protestant Churches seem to have been driven away by the pressure of the critical thought of our time. All the more refreshing is it to hear again the ringing note of conviction, the emphasis on sin and the need of redemption, the proclamation of the authority of the Word of God, of the tremendous issues at stake, and of the fatefulness of the gospel for time and for eternity. To the Christian preacher these are a challenge and a rebuke. For it seems at times that the preachers of a former day, with all their narrowness, if you choose to call it so, *did* make men tremble at the Word of God, whereas we, with all our critical apparatus and modern culture, appear to have succeeded in teaching them that there is nothing in God's Word to tremble at. Be that as it may, the Barthian School seems fitted to act as a wholesome tonic to our age. Some years ago a writer in the *Times Literary Supplement* ventured the suggestion that the coming revival of religion might be 'waiting for the time when we are able to respond more vigorously to the presentation of the gospel most intimately associated with St. Paul.' It may be that the Barthian Movement will incline the mind of the Church in that direction, and thus help to bring back authority to the preacher's message and a revival of evangelical religion.

---

## The Doctrine of 'Particular Guidance.'

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE GROUP MOVEMENT.

BY THE REVEREND J. VERNON BARTLET, D.D., OXFORD.

I WAS very glad to read in the last issue of this magazine the article on 'Guidance' by my friend the Rev. J. P. Thornton-Duesbery. For the future both of the Oxford Group Movement itself and

of its relation to the Church at large—the most vital matter in the long run—turns very largely upon reaching a true doctrine about Guidance; and that means, in the last resort, a true theory

for the mind, one which can be taught and received on the basis of something more than the 'pragmatic' test that it 'works' in the experience of individuals or of special circles, within the limits of their own knowledge over a given period of time. One difficulty in applying such a test is that the *negative* results or 'fruits' are less visible in any case than the positive, especially to the actors themselves, and are slow in becoming fully realized.

But beyond this consideration, which should make one chary of judging by given cases, and those naturally the most striking of the 'positive' ones—chosen to illustrate the theory in the light of which the witness himself for the time views and recounts the facts as Divinely planned—there is a second, which should give all thoughtful minds pause. And that is, that the experience of Christians generally, in all times and places, has on the whole tried and found wanting the theory of 'particular' guidance, at any rate as *the principle* to be assumed and acted on as the will of God in the normal decisions of a loyal obedience. They have so judged both on the basis of the widest and most varied experience, and of their reading of Scripture as a whole, alike as a record of experience and of theory. Here the history of the Society of Friends seems specially relevant, since it has long held and practised—within certain limits, more and more carefully defined, if I mistake not—the doctrine of particular 'concerns,' as affording more 'particular' guidance for individuals than that commonly the lot even of whole-hearted seeking for Divine light in one's daily walk. For their doctrine on the subject to-day does not, I believe, cover all that is being taken for granted in 'Group' circles as the ordinary everyday privilege of any fully surrendered 'changed life,' from the very first.

But, after all, it is the main concern of this study of a very sacred subject, on which equally devoted Christians have always differed not a little, to deprecate any facile appeal to 'results' so far as within any individual or group experience—particularly thus early—in the history of this last and striking form of 'personal evangelism.' For its actual fruits, in the main, all Christians who have been looking and praying for real revival of 'life-changing' power in the Church may well give thanks to God. But the more any of us may trust that it will prove to be a prelude and leaven of quickening life and power within the Church of Christ, subserving God's great plan to make the organized Christian Society itself the mighty

witness to His power, the means of its spread to humanity at large through personal regeneration as it was at the first and is meant ever to be; by so much the more must we long that the Group Movement may rest on sure Scriptural truth at this point of its emphasis and method. In this spirit and to that end, then, what follows is offered as a sincere contribution.

The doctrine of 'particular guidance'—and that alone is what is in question—characteristic of the Groups, but as a rule assumed rather than made explicit in any exact form, is one which does not seem to be laid down or taught *in principle* in Scripture itself. It is not simply that the Spirit of God guides Christians, so far as single-eyed and docile, 'into all the truth,' as a body of principles implicit in Christ's own moral personality and His teaching—His 'commands' in which he who 'loves' Him truly will abide—as set forth in Jn 14-15. What is claimed in the Group Movement goes beyond this both in principle and mode of operation. It bases itself almost entirely on certain quite exceptional cases reported in the Book of Acts in the ministry of certain specially inspired missionaries, like Philip the Evangelist in Ac 8 and Paul at one or two great crises of his journeys, as these were interpreted by Luke or his informant, as the case might be. But surely this is not enough to warrant a far-reaching doctrine of general application.

The mark of the normal guidance above described in Jn 14-15 is that it is sharing of thoughts as between 'friends' (Jn 15<sup>15</sup>), *i.e.* by *insight* into the principles common to the greater and the inferior party in the friendship and kinship of aims. But, while Mr. Duesbery would fain do justice to this, he in fact describes, later on, such guidance as he thinks 'has been vital in the gaining of its success,' as coming in the form of 'orders,' impressed upon the mind as it waits on God. Such a specific order comes through a 'real "conversation" in which God makes known His will' in quite particular, *en bloc* form, viz. one embodying a 'contingent' injunction—to do this or that, and even in a given way. Thus it goes quite *beyond any insight* into its intrinsic fitness or wisdom (under all the conditions, known only to God) then possible to His 'friend' as recipient. Surely that is very like the type of telephonic message, 'coming through' gradually into final distinctness, which he himself disclaims, so far as it 'carries with it the infallibility of a sort of divine tape-machine.'

I fear the suggestion that particular guidance is to be recognized primarily by the overmastering



strength of the impression that such or such step is God's will in relation to a particular person, place, time, or other contingent form in which a principle is to be applied, does tend to invest certain impressions with a practical claim to infallibility. Otherwise the special doctrine means nothing distinctive, and leaves the responsibility for the particular line of action still with the personal judgment, and its share of the general insight progressively vouchsafed to the docile and waiting will. And that is what all serious Christians alike hold.

As regards the safeguard against practical error, in following strong impressions of conscience with blind obedience even in details of form, which Mr. Duesbery sees in the fact that 'the Group

teaches that God's guidance is to be "checked" in various ways,' especially through 'Group Guidance' about an individual's 'order'—I cannot see how this can be held consistently with the *absolute* nature of the guidance already described. It does not, if genuine, admit of being 'checked,' though the individual may be helped by advice as to how to carry out *his part* of the act of fulfilling it.

But the subject cannot here be worked out completely. Enough to have entered a serious *caveat*, and started fraternal conference on this grave subject, fraught as it is with far-reaching issues, and particularly as regards the relations of the Group Movement to normal methods of organized church life and work.

## In the Study.

### Virginibus Puerisque.

When the Lights went out.

BY THE REVEREND FREDERIC C. SPURR,  
BIRMINGHAM.

'Among whom ye shine as lights in the world.'—  
Ph 2<sup>16</sup>.

At ten o'clock on Wednesday night, October 21, all the electric lights in America suddenly went out for one minute. Everything was in darkness. Then they were all switched on again. Everybody knew what was going to happen, and in that minute of darkness everybody thought of one man, Thomas Alma Edison, for on that day his body had been buried. And the moment of darkness was meant to remind the world how much it owed to the great inventor whose funeral had taken place a few hours earlier. For you know that Mr. Edison was one of the most wonderful men the world has ever seen. It is to him that we owe the electric light which brightens up our churches, our streets, and our homes. He lived to be eighty-four, and he worked eighteen hours a day for the greater part of his life. I suppose you have read in the papers the story of his wonderful life, how he started as a very poor boy with little education, how he had to sell newspapers for a living, and how cruelly he was treated by a bad-tempered man who beat him on the head and made him deaf for life. Yet in spite of all that, he determined to succeed, and at length he became the greatest inventor the world has ever known.

But it was the going out of those lights that interested me most of all. When I read the story in the paper I began to wonder what would happen if all the 'lights' of the world were to go out, not for one minute, but for always. Suppose we were suddenly deprived of all the wonderful inventions that have been made during the last few years. Suppose there were no electric light, no motor-cars, no typewriters, no railway trains, no flying machines. Suppose that some magician, with a wave of his wand, could cause all these things suddenly to vanish, and leave us where our grandfathers were. What a dull world it would be! Do you think you would like to live in such a world? It would mean good-bye to those seaside holidays we so much enjoy. There would be no more jolly runs in the car on Saturday afternoons. Of course, we might learn to love our own towns and homes better than we do. But still we should not like the change, should we?

But now let us suppose something else. Suppose that all the lights of education went out, that all we know about history, and the sun, and the great universe, and the people who live in India, Africa, and the rest of the world, and the way things grow, and how to use Nature—if all that light suddenly went out, wouldn't it be dreadful? And suppose the cleverness of doctors and surgeons and dentists and nurses was all to be swept away in a moment, and people had to suffer as they used to do, wouldn't it be a terrible world to live in?

And then suppose that the light of the gospel

suddenly went out and left us in darkness, so that we knew nothing of the dear Father in Heaven, and not a word about the life of Jesus; and when our friends died we could not be sure that we should ever see them again. I think that would be awful, don't you? You see there would be no Christian hymns to sing, and none of those fine tunes you love so well. If we thought of God at all we should be afraid of Him, and perhaps do cruel things to try to please Him. I once saw a woman in India with a heavy chain round her feet which she dragged along. She was taking a long journey of more than a thousand miles to try to save her soul. What a difference it would have made to her if she had known of the loving God of whom Jesus taught us! And if our gospel light went out we might be like her.

I expect when the lights went out in America for one minute, the people felt very thankful to Mr. Edison for what he had done in perfecting the electric light. And they must have been glad that the darkness lasted only a minute. It reminded them of their debt to him.

It is a good thing to stop for a moment and remember our debt to those who have made our way so much brighter than it was for our fathers. It would be dreadfully mean if we were to say, 'I don't care what they did for us. I've got these good things and I mean to enjoy them. It does not matter to me who worked hard to make us more comfortable.' We don't talk like that. No, we erect monuments to these great men, and these monuments mean Thank you; we do not mean to forget, and we will make good use of the things they have given to us.

We owe most of all to Jesus Christ, because He has given to the world all the best things it possesses. And we ought to say 'thank you' and mean it. The best way of being thankful is to live bright Christian lives and to 'shine as lights in the world.' That is what St. Paul said to his friends at Philippi. Let me give you a little picture of what I mean. In the city of Jerusalem there is a wonderful old church called the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. I have often been into it. It is supposed to mark the place where Jesus was crucified. Well! on Easter eve a great crowd of people gathers in the churchyard and in the church itself. You can scarcely move, and often people are crushed. All the lights are put out, excepting one in the inner part of the church. Everybody is as silent as the grave for a moment or two, and then suddenly there is a great shout. What is the matter? A few men near the minister light their candles from his

lamp, and then the thousands of people who have brought unlighted candles with them rush forward to get a light from each other. It takes a long time, but it is a wonderful sight to see all these points of light spring up. It is like fairyland. And then the people carry the lighted candles to their homes, and kindle all other lights from them. All the city is lighted from that one lamp in the church. Now that is the way in which Jerusalem shows its thankfulness. It carries the light everywhere. You do not need that I should point a moral. That little picture tells its own story.

### Radio Rails.

BY THE REVEREND HARRY WHITEHEAD, WILMSLOW MANCHESTER.

'This is the way, walk ye in it.'—Is 30<sup>21</sup>.

Ugh! Who likes fog? Have you ever been lost in a fog? I was lost once. It is a queer sensation, I can tell you. I turned to the right then to the left, then backwards, then forwards until I found myself wandering round and round not knowing where on earth I was.

I think no one likes fog. I'm sure the sailors does not. The engine-driver and the busman don't. How the trains and buses crawl along! How the sirens scream and the fog-signals bang! However, though it is very unpleasant, the train cannot very well get lost because it runs on rails. The ship can creep along as slow as slow can be. But—have you ever thought of it?—what can the poor airman do? He cannot stop in mid-air. He doesn't pass through lighted streets which tell him where he is. There are no rails for him to keep him straight. He must feel lost.

Now I read of a great idea the other day. Here it is. To provide rails for airmen! Rails for airmen! But surely! Yes, Radio rails. It is like this. About half-way between Dover and Paris is Abbeville in France. At Abbeville two radio 'frames' were placed a short distance apart. One sent out a directional beam wireless signal. This was a continuous 'F' in the Morse code. You know, the dots and dashes signal. The other sent out a continuous 'L' in the Morse code. These two signals joined to form a straight 'beam' of line between Dover and Paris.

Here is the point you must notice. While the airman flew along this line he could hear a buzz caused by the mingling of the two signals. If he turned to one side he heard the signal 'F' clearly and knew he was getting off the line. If he heard the signal 'L' clearly he knew he was getting to



ar to the other side and off the right track. He had to keep in just that line where he heard the buzz caused by 'F' and 'L' together, so back into the right line he would come. So you see that in the thickest fog or the darkest night the airman can be guided by hearing this buzz. Is it not a fine idea? But then, I have known something like that for years. You may wonder why I did not mention it before. Well, it is not just the same idea but it is like it. On our way through life God has provided signals to guide us and keep us straight. When we are apt to go astray from the right track we hear a voice just as the airman hears the Morse signal. This voice says, 'Not that way,' 'No, not that way.' 'This is the way, walk in it.' Believe me, I have lived long enough to know that while I obey that voice I keep straight and in the right way, but when I do not listen to it I get lost, just as the airman would do who should say, 'Oh! other the signal, I shall go where I like.' I am sure you will be wise to listen. There is no need for you to lose your way in the world. God will guide you safely home if you will listen to His signal. Have you ever sung this?

When to the right or left I stray,  
His voice behind me may I hear—  
Return, and walk in Christ thy way;  
Fly back to Christ for sin is near!

and so in that voice of Conscience God has provided for us also our 'Radio rails.'

## The Christian Year.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

### Love's Dimensions.

'That ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.'—  
Eph 3<sup>17-19</sup>.

The phrase, 'the love of Christ,' profoundly moves us. The feelings it calls forth, the images it excites, are not the passing moods or the distorted fancies of baseless imagination; they are the natural outcome of profound experience and the spontaneous expression of intense reality. To trace this love is to become explorers in an unending realm of delight, where the great and good have never worshipped and adored. The dimensions of that immense territory are expressed in the text in terms of 'Breadth' and 'Length,' and 'Depth' and 'Height'!

We will measure love, then, by its Breadth. And its breadth is surely sympathy. What else could it be? Sympathy is an overflowing emotion, and spreads far and wide. It is the power to enter into another person's experience and feel it as one's own. Men who love always have this power, and use it; and the more widely one is able to make it effective the more he reveals the greatness of his love. So we say:

For the love of God is broader  
Than the measures of man's mind;  
And the Heart of the Eternal  
Is most wonderfully kind.

Then take the measurement of Length. The length of love is surely its service. For what else could 'length' be? There is, as it were, a going on and on, without bound or limit, of the services and ministry of love. It is true that we can serve without loving. Men often serve without loving either their work or their employer; and the pity of it is, that our service then dwindles and becomes poor, or becomes mere 'eye-service' and hateful to us. But though we may serve without loving, we cannot, even if we would, love without serving, or seeking spontaneously and joyously the opportunities of serving. We measure it, as it were, by its reach, by the continuity of its helpfulness, by service.

Then we will measure love by its Depth! And the depth of love is surely its cost. Love has always a supreme gladness at its heart simply in loving. It may bring no suffering while life passes untroubled; but let hours of need arise and suffering then becomes love's tenderest joy, and the measure of the suffering is the measure of the love. The sweetness of human intercourse, indeed, depends on these implicit guarantees of love.

Finally, we will measure love by its Height. And its height is found in the power to forgive. Forgiveness is the hardest hill we have to climb. We say we can forgive but not forget. That is where we do not love. When we forgive we do forget. But this is only possible out of a lofty love. Forgiveness is love at its height, and perhaps this is its supreme test.

So, then, we are called to measure the sympathy and the service, and the cost and the forgiveness, of the love of Christ.

How broad and complete was His sympathy! He renounced His equality with God; He divested Himself of Divine prerogative; He left the pre-existent glory; He entered into our life. Does the poor man care any the more for the rich man

because the latter makes him gifts? Let a man go to his brother in any time of need; let him be frank and free and friendly (as God meant us all to be); let him try to understand his brother's life—his work, his play, his hobby, his weakness, his fears, his hopes; let him close up the gulf between them by a living human sympathy: how great, then, is the response of a willing gratitude! It was in this way that Christ came among us—to tread the earth we tread, to live the life we live, to leave no man out, to express a universal love, to know all our hopes and our sorrows and our joys, our temptations and fears and prayers—so that all our poor, weak, blinded, stunted, hardened lives might be illumined and inspired and warmed and strengthened by sympathy. As we measure His love by service, is there anything not only more tenderly beautiful, but also more strongly sustained, than the ministry of Jesus in the cities and villages of Palestine? His selflessness in service knew no break, so far as we can trace, wherever human sorrow and sin confronted Him. Then, as the sympathy and the service of Christ were sealed by the cost He paid, we come to the measurement of depth! He daily foresaw the abyss of suffering which His soul must sound, and to it He made a daily self-dedication—‘The Son of man must needs go to Jerusalem.’ What shall we say of the depth of sorrow in His tragic death? Can we speak at all of the agony of the Son of Man? For it was supremely moral and spiritual, and only, incidentally, physical. And from that depth of love's cost, He rose to the height of love's forgiveness—‘Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.’ What a cry rang out that night! Then was His heart broken for love. Not till afterwards did men ever know how much was at stake in His sufferings, how much they needed to be forgiven, and to what transcendent height Christ's love lifted Him up for us all.

But not yet have we explored all. The love of Christ is a love that passes knowledge. It merges and passes, as we measure it, into the breadth and length, and depth and height of the eternal love of God. It ascends into and becomes manifest as the Divine Love. From heaven it enthalls us, and, as it enthalls, it transforms us; just where it becomes measureless it transfigures us. Its light falls upon our life and blesses it.

Oh, to know that there is a tender love always about us; to believe that the harsher side of nature and the cruelties of man are not the ultimate realities! Oh, to feel that we are not being crushed in the remorseless movements of unguided circum-

stance or evil destiny, but rather daily gathered up into the Everlasting Arms, which draw us to the heart of love!

¶ The Eternal love of God was J. H. Jowett's basal doctrine of Christianity, and he proclaimed the illimitable love of God with unwearied insistence. This ‘apprehending love grip’ he believed to be equally true of those existing in dreary rooms and tenements and of the weary souls in stately castles confronting wide domains. ‘I have proclaimed,’ he said, ‘that everybody is in the love grip of the Eternal. Is there a bigger thing than that to say to anybody? Can I get anybody to tell me of a bigger thing than this infinitude—“God knows them and loves them with an everlasting love”?’ ‘They that bring sunshine into the heart of others,’ says Sir James Barrie, ‘cannot keep it from themselves,’ and Jowett's message of comfort, deriving from his certitude of the everlasting love of God, sustained his own soul and actuated his life.<sup>1</sup>

There is still one clause in our text which must be considered. ‘That ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend . . .’ What does this mean? It means that we may pass on to know more and more of the love of Christ in so far as we have some—it may be very small—affinity for it, only in so far as we have something which is also a capacity for the larger knowledge. We must have a moral kinship with Christ in order to begin. If we have some trace of a power to love, we have also the guarantee of our power to explore increasingly the love divine.

Here is the simplest illustration. A mother's love pours itself out on two sons equally. The one is selfish and eagerly secures the benefits of her sacrifice. He knows his own material good fortune and congratulates himself daily on it. But does he know her love? Of course not: he is in a deeper outer darkness, and neither knows her as his mother nor himself as her son. He has not the root of the matter in him. The other son, who is no egoist, sees these loving, daily acts and tender ministrations, and he loves that mother. He knows her heart—he comes to know its every beat; and in interpreting every act in the terms of an understanding affection, he knows her love as love. For him is reserved the knowledge of a mother and the joy of being a son. Rooted and grounded in love, he is able to apprehend ‘what is the length and breadth, and depth and height.’

Let us lay hold of this inexhaustible love, and be rid of every fear.

A little child lay very ill. Some one had taught

<sup>1</sup> A. Porritt, *John Henry Jowett*, 215.



im, 'The Lord is my Shepherd,' and it was his wont, each day, to count the five words slowly out upon his fingers; and when loving hands turned down the counterpane, when the last breath he drew had flickered out, and the little life had passed to the eternal keeping, they found he was touching with one finger of his right hand the third finger of his left. He had stopped at 'my.' In the moment of the great transition, it was thus he passed over the glad threshold, filled with the fullness of God—apprehending in his child-soul, the breadth and length, and depth and height of the divine.<sup>1</sup>

#### FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

##### Unrealized Purposes.

'And the Lord said unto David my father, Whereas was in mine heart to build an house unto my name, thou didst well that it was in mine heart. Nevertheless thou shalt not build the house; but thy son that shall come forth out of thy loins, he shall build the house unto my name.'—1 K 8<sup>18-19</sup>.

1. Let us think first of the purpose which was denied. It was pure and beautiful, and it was evidently in accord with the will of God. That makes its denial perplexing. We can understand the defeat of a desire that is unworthy. To be rich or famous, to set men talking of our exploits, an ambition which we can understand the breath of God blowing on and withering for the health of man's soul. But this—was there ever anything more beautiful?

A sense of shame came over David as he thought of his own well-appointed and convenient house, and then of the primitive provision made for the work of God. A tent for meeting was all very well while the people lived in tents, but the nation had outgrown its primitive condition. In David's judgment it was a flagrant inconsistency for a man who believed in God to surround himself with the manner of conveniences, and to leave religion cramped or meanly provided for. And he had ever the conviction that if a man served God at all, it must not be with the margins and dregs left over when everything else had been lavishly provided for. He simply refused to serve God with that which cost him nothing. He had earned the right to repose and ease, and we could well have understood it if he had said, 'Let my son build the temple; I have struggled hard in my time, let me rest.' But it was not in him to say it. He wanted to crown a life's work by devoting the whole of his

days of leisure and his gathered gold to the building of a house for the Lord. It was that desire that was vetoed. So then we draw the inference from the incident that some of the purest and highest and best purposes of our lives may be unrealized—not that they may be thwarted by human opposition or demoniacal obstruction, or by our own hindering weakness, but that they may be defeated by the will of God.

We are all of us impressed with the mystery of life in this regard, that some are bereaved of their dearest, are denied the gift of children or wealth, of which it seems that they would make such good use. But perhaps the most perplexing denials of all are the denials to do a part of what we feel to be God's will, to give what would help on His cause. There are few things more trying than the inability to do what the heart longs to do of good. To be hindered by bodily weakness, poverty, crowding duties, from doing the dearest thing is painful discipline. It is a remarkable fact that some of the things of which we never dream in life come to us, and some of the things most dearly longed for are denied, and we may say of both—'This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.' It is impossible to think that David ever dreamt of a throne while he kept his father's sheep. He was quite devoid of ambition in that direction. What he never sought God gave him. Then the thing that he longed for was denied. So many of us are in positions to-day that we never dreamt of, and never sought. In business, in the Church, God has given us what we dare not have hoped for, and what some people would give everything to possess, while some dearly coveted thing has been denied us. What does it mean? Surely that God shapes man's course, and that our plans and ambitions should be brought into subjection to His will. To take an illustration from the life of St. Paul. He never intended to preach in the province of Galatia apparently; he was passing through it with his eye on some other place, and he was stricken down with malarial fever, or some affliction, and during his illness it became clear that it was there that God intended him to labour. On the other hand, he was forbidden to preach the gospel in Asia Minor, and when he essayed to go into Bithynia, the Spirit suffered him not. What does that mean? Why, that a man may be commanded to preach where he least of all wanted, and forbidden to preach the gospel of salvation where he most of all wanted.

2. Another inference to be drawn from this denial is that every man has his limitations even in

spiritual service. The reason given to David for this denial of his dear purpose was, 'Thou hast shed blood abundantly, and made great wars.' We are disposed to say that it matters very little who does the work so it be done, but all God's dealings with men contradict that theory. When He wants men to go as missionaries from the early Church, He does not merely command that men be sent. The Holy Ghost says, 'Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them.' One apostle for the circumcision, another for the uncircumcision, and if you try to change them about you will spoil the lives of both. George Matheson had certain ambitions for the ministry, and those who knew him say that along that line he would have done brilliantly, but God closed his eyes, and he was shut up to another kind of work, which no one can doubt has been of inestimable value to the Church of Christ.

3. Observe David's behaviour under this disappointment.

There is no murmuring, but a ready and adoring acquiescence in the will of God. David went in and sat before the Lord and worshipped. We think of what might have happened, and most likely would, if the purpose had been mixed with selfishness, and the ambition had not been pure. There would have been annoyance, resentment, and when the reason for the denial was given, he would have asked, 'Who made me a man of war? For whose sake have I over and over again imperilled my life? Was it that I loved war, or was it that I was driven to it by the will of God, when I would far rather have been composing songs for the sanctuary and building a house of prayer?'

He does all he can to provide for another to carry the work through. That is the crowning grace of the incident. The Temple would never be called by his name, he would never see it, but he went on accumulating materials for it as generously and lavishly as if he had known that he would stand in the centre of its splendour on the day of its opening, and be recognized as the originator of the whole glorious plan. We have known something different: people who have refused to take any part in a scheme because they were not allowed to take the first part, and others who have adversely criticised everything that was done because they had not the doing of it, or because their efforts or gifts were not adequately recognized. Here is a man who, with all his sad faults and marring vices, is grandly free from the small and petty vice of personal ambition. It matters nothing to him who carries out the work so that the will of

God is done. And we may well believe that there is a will of God in the thwarting of our plans and the denial of our hopes, even when those plans and hopes are pure and laudable; that there is some reason for the denial, and that it costs God pain to cross our desire and wish.

4. The last lesson of all is that it is a good thing to have high desires and aims, though they should never be realized. After all, the man who has accomplished all he meant to do in the way of character and service, probably did not mean much. And the man who has given up hoping and dreaming of higher and better things has made a fatal mistake. There may be an awful disparity between what we meant to do and be of good, and the actual achievements of our life, but we are all the better for the high dream and purpose. It has refined and ennobled our character, and lifted us nearer to God. Moreover, it is accepted of Him. We may do what is accounted a great and good thing, we may persist in doing it in face of God's will as David might have persisted in the building of the Temple, or we may do it from a low motive. Then though men applaud it, God turns away from it and His benediction can never rest on it. On the contrary, what a man fails to reach, so his heart and motive be high and pure, is accepted.<sup>1</sup>

Not on the vulgar mass  
Called 'work,' must sentence pass,  
Things done, that took the eye and had the  
price;  
O'er which, from level stand,  
The low world laid its hand,  
Found straightway to its mind, could value  
in a trice:

Thoughts hardly to be packed  
Into a narrow act,  
Fancies that broke through language and  
escaped;  
All I could never be,  
All, men ignored in me,  
This I was worth to God.

#### SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION.

##### The Church at Home and Overseas.

'The Word was made flesh.'—Jn 1<sup>4</sup>.

I <sup>2</sup> often remember those blest and happy days which I spent with Bishop Westcott before I entered Holy Orders. He was then new to his

<sup>1</sup> C. Brown, *God and Man*, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pollock, Bishop of Norwich.



position as Bishop of Durham. Well do I remember those readings we had together, those explanations he would give of any difficulties I had found in the New Testament, which often enriched me with some finer conception which I could afterwards treasure in my mind and ponder for myself.

Particularly do I recall how he promised that towards the end of my time with him he would give me a passage the careful reading of which was to set the coping-stone on his teaching. Before left him he set me the task of writing a short note on the words of St. John, 'The Word was made flesh.' My youthful inexperience could find nothing more in it than a statement of the true and entire humanity of our Lord. At the foot of my sheet, however, he added the following comment: 'All that you say is undoubtedly true; but whereas the word *ἄνθρωπος* denotes an individual of the human race, the word *σάρξ* represents the race as such; our Lord, as man, united in His Person all those various qualities that are scattered over the whole body of men in all ages and places; He is the centre, the focus where all meet. See the Epistle to the Galatians (3<sup>28</sup>), the word *εἰς*, and Goldwin Smith's remarks on the character of our Lord.' It was this that he was reserving till the last.

Our Lord's human nature, as shown in His human life, was not circumscribed like our own, it was unlimited in its universality, its comprehensiveness, and its inclusiveness. What an appeal made to every nation under the sun by this fact.

He comprises in Himself all the qualities that are und scattered over the whole number of men. Jesus was man, but, even setting aside all considerations of His divinity, He was more than a mere individual man. Nothing proper to man, as created, but is presented in Him. He is the example to every man and of the whole of man. To force this point home we shall return to the lectures on the story of Goldwin Smith mentioned above. The point is brilliantly expounded there, and we may almost reproduce his actual words.

The virtues of the human race, as we see them, appear scattered over different individuals; in Jesus they appear combined. Some are masculine, some feminine. But manly strength and womanly sweetness are both attributes of mankind, so both appear in the character of Jesus, who thus includes the two sections of the race in Himself. Again, different virtues flourish at different times, and in which each age contributes in some respect to advance and beautify the human ideal. Jesus transcends the ideal of any single age. Different countries and different races seem better fitted to

practise different virtues. There is a great difference here between the peoples of Europe and Asia. But all good, whether sprung from east or from west, or from any other quarter, appears in nobler form in Jesus. Good men, as a rule, make a stronger claim either to our admiration or to our love. But who, however closely he scan the pattern of Jesus' life, can say whether it demands our love or our admiration the more?

Our Lord Jesus is free from all extremes in either direction—a fact which must appear marvellous, nay, rather divinely supernatural, if we think what the world was like in His day. The Jews, impatient of the Roman yoke, would have thought that they were betraying their past traditions and their future hopes had they not resorted to arms or some sort of resistance, in the hope of restoring the Kingdom of God, as they conceived it. But Jesus, with all His faithfulness to God combining a truer view of His Kingdom, would not make Himself their champion, would not claim, in a restricted sense, for His own anything that could not belong to the whole race. He loved His country well and, 'seeing the city, he wept over it.' His were the words 'salvation is of the Jews,' and in Jerusalem He recognized the centre of God's purposes in the past. But, for all that, He could say, 'The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father, but the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.' He did not claim God as the special God of the Jews; He declared Him to be the Father of the whole race of men and of every individual member of it. Indifferent as He was to the particular aspirations of the Jews, He was equally free from anything that distinguished the Greeks or Romans from men in general. There was nothing in Him to bind Him to any one land, no touch of vice or virtue to divorce Him from the whole race. He lived, indeed, as any other member of His native land; He was man, and employed the customs, the language, the dress of His country. But in His character, His mind, and His life we find nothing that is not universal. The life of Christ transcends any dissimilarity or distinction of race.<sup>1</sup>

¶ Jesus is the only figure in history who is felt by the people of every land to be their particular kind and kin. E. Stanley Jones in his impassioned book tells how a cultured Brahman, talking to a missionary said, 'I don't like the Christ of your creeds and the Christ of your churches.' And the missionary asked him quietly, 'Then how would you like

<sup>1</sup> B. Pollock, *The Church and English Life*, 38.

the Christ of the Indian Road?' The Brahman thought for a moment, picturing Christ in the crowds around him, healing blind men, putting His hands on the lepers, telling the broken folks of India of the Kingdom of God, staggering up a hill to His Cross and dying there and coming back from His grave to walk among the Indian throngs again, and the Brahman said, very earnestly, 'I could love and follow the Christ of the Indian Road.' That is the only Christ India will follow or can; its own Christ. And that is true for every other race and clan of men. Jesus was a Jew, but who thinks of Him as one? As Sidney Lanier phrased it, He is 'all men's Comrade, Servant, King, or Priest,' and the new note in Chinese thinking, that Jesus was an Oriental and that if the Chinese are to be Christians they will take Christ but not Western Christianity, tells the same story.<sup>1</sup>

The same is true of those differences that divide the adherents of a system or a school; what is true is His, what is not true is not His, nor did He establish any rule that is not fit for all men in all places to follow. Bold would he be that should say that any part of Jesus' teaching is discordant or out of date. Living among Pharisees, Sadducees, and other factions, He never inclined to any of them; nor, more wonderful still, did He ever recoil from any of them to the opposite extreme. Moreover, He has none of those seeming virtues which only suit one time or one race; such virtues, where they are found, are indeed accounted virtues, inasmuch as their removal would lead to a general deterioration, but their use and value are merely occasional, and had Jesus been distinguished by such His human nature must have suffered in universality.

Lastly, there is nothing of excess or deficiency in Jesus, nothing too that stands out pre-eminent in His life or nature. Such a pre-eminence of any single virtue depends either on its own success or on its presence in the absence of others. The example of Jesus' human nature, then, will never grow faint or die, and there is no possible substitute for it. His human nature is human in a universal sense; every ethical quality that men require in any time or in any race appeared, once and for all, in the Son of Man when He dwelt with men. This is the sense of His own words, 'When the comforter is come, he will convict the world in respect of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more.'

The words so constantly on the lips of St. Paul—'in Christ Jesus'—draw from this their source and

life. 'If he were only an individual man he could not gather all men unto himself: the phrase "in Christ" . . . the historic expression of justification by faith, would have no meaning.' Jesus though true man, was not a mere man, not one of the crowd: He *was* man, in whom the whole race could be, so to speak, summed up.

'Seeing that He unites in Himself,' wrote Bishop Westcott in a brilliant passage, 'all that is truly manly and truly womanly, stripped of all the accidental forms, which belong to some one country or to some one period, every one can therefore find in Him for his own work union with the eternal': 'for his own *work*'—shall we rather say for his own *life* union with the eternal?

Jesus Christ is therefore the one and the all, a sufficient hope of the world; and those who see Him as He is recognize in Him an adequate Saviour. He is a Saviour indeed for this world and the world to come, as is immediately recognized when once our missionaries have put all that He is and all that He is able to do before the eyes of their converts. And as for the token of their commission from Him, is it not manifest in their own love for these wandering children of God? Love speaks a language which all men can understand without translation. Some of these children of God may have civilizations far, far older than our own; some may have intellects and minds from which we may learn much. But if they have not the mind of Christ, they are only men having no hope, without God in the world. When we pass from the men of learning and civilization of whatever degree to the miserable, ignorant, down-trodden, degraded and suffering, if all that we have been saying is true, what joy for them to hear from us, that the Lord Jesus has suffered as they have suffered, that He knows from the inside what is meant by pain and persecution; what joy for them to come to us for relief for all their sickness and agonies of body to the Christian doctor and the Christian nurse who He has sent. Except for sin, He has known every phase of human life. No one is outside the range of His sympathy. 'Unto them that look for Him shall He appear'; and may He truly appear to our blinded sight at home, to all who open their gaze to see Him as the missionaries proclaim Him abroad—the Friend, the Saviour, the Master, the King, the Son of Man, the Son of God.

Passing deeper than the necessary distinction in the home and the Foreign Field, let us emphasize yet once again that we are all one, whatever our nation, tribe, capacity, language, colour, civilization, or position; we are all one man, one in Christ.

<sup>1</sup> J. M. M. Gray, *Concerning the Faith*, 228.



Jesus, who, Himself Man and God, has through His all-inclusive human nature redeemed us by the blood of His Cross, and in His Ascension as the Head of the human race has presented us before the throne of God. This on His side; on ours it is for us, for our brethren at home, for our brethren overseas, to carry in every direction the story of His great love.<sup>1</sup>

#### WHITSUNDAY.

##### The Second Birth.

'The wind bloweth where it listeth.'—Jn 3<sup>8</sup>.

There is no doubt that the doctrine of the second birth, or birth according to the Spirit, is fundamental evangelical doctrine. It is Pauline, as well as Johannine. We recall St. Paul's language about 'begetting children in Christ through the gospel'; and that other extraordinary expression about his being in travail until Christ should be formed in them, where St. Paul imagines himself to be father and mother by turns to his spiritual children. And the doctrine is Petrine as well as Pauline, as we can see by the reference to being born again of the incorruptible seed, etc. It is even Jacobean, to our surprise. All these metaphors show that the doctrine of being twice-born is in the New Testament throughout, and must have been there from the first. And we see that it is recognized as being New Testament doctrine by the earnestness of those who seek to explain it away by the help of the pagan parallels, according to which the initiate into the heathen mysteries obtained regeneration through baths of blood or other means.

What is the origin of the report of the discourse that passed between Jesus and the Rabbi? From whom does it proceed? No other persons were present. Does the account come from Jesus or from Nicodemus? If from the latter, then we have a piece of a real gospel according to Nicodemus, to set off against the celebrated Apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus which relates our Lord's descent into Hades and other legendary matter. And supposing this to be Nicodemus' story of his own conversion told to the author of the Fourth Gospel, it is always interesting to hear a man's conversion as told by himself; moreover, that would give us a parallel to the story of Paul's conversion as told by himself, and then retold by Luke. It would be even more interesting if the other alternative were correct, and Jesus were Himself the prime authority for his conversion-story as told by St. John. Which was it? To answer that question, our best way

is to ask another: have we any parallel phenomena? The answer is easy—as regards the Fourth Gospel, especially easy. We have only to go on to the next chapter, where we find our Lord discoursing with a woman by a well, not a single disciple being present, not even St. John. Unless these accounts are merely edifying romances, it must have been from Jesus that the story of the Samaritan woman was derived. For the disciples, who were astonished that their Master should thus talk with a woman, were hardly likely to take the woman herself on one side and ask her to reproduce the conversation. And even if she told it to her fellow-townsmen, as she probably did again and again, Samaria is not one of the accepted sources for the evangelical record. Moreover, we want a solution which covers both cases—Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman—and as many more as may be requiring similar treatment; and this can only mean that the real source is Jesus, reported through His disciple.

A noble sentence in Geikie's *Life of Christ* affirms that the veil of the Temple was first rent at Jacob's well, and that Jesus went forth to consecrate the whole earth as one Holy of Holies. If the observation be correct, we need only to emphasize it by saying that the veil was rent, if rent at all, by Christ's own hands. We must not credit this universalist doctrine to Nicodemus, who at some later day shook off his surviving Judaistic limitations; nor to St. John, migrated from Jacob's well to Plato's, and now become at home on a more capacious bosom than that on which he first leaned. The wisdom of the outlook must have been there in the original speaker.

Now let us come to the special word about the wind that bloweth 'where it listeth,' and this includes 'when it listeth.' At first sight such language appears to deal with something arbitrary and capricious: it harmonizes with the doctrine of Divine sovereignty rather than with the doctrine of Divine grace. We feel like leaves before the gale—one leaf caught, another left, one blown this way and another that way. Was this what Jesus meant? Is it right to call this the open door, which the wind sometimes opens and sometimes slams? Can we reconcile the statement 'where it listeth' with the invitation 'Come unto me all ye that labour,' so as to make a single doctrine of grace out of them? Surely we must ask further questions of Jesus about the wind, such as, 'Where does it list?' and 'When does it list?'

Where does the Lord list? The answers come in from the Old Testament as well as from the New;

<sup>1</sup> B. Pollock, *The Church and English Life*, 42.

for the New Testament did not invent the Holy Spirit. One elementary answer runs on this wise: 'To that man will I look, that is of a humble and contrite heart and that trembleth at my word.' Here God's looking is another phrase for God's loving—as we read that Jesus looked, and loved; and God's loving means God's giving of Himself, in one form or other of heavenly plenitude.

Another Old Testament answer occurs in Is 44<sup>3</sup>: 'I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring.' Here we are expressly told that the gift of the Holy Spirit is for those who long for God. When we have got as far as that, we begin to see that there are two 'lists'—one, the Spirit who breathes where He lists; and the other, the soul that lists to be breathed upon. Moreover, we must not take the word 'list' as used of indefinite, casual desire: it is closely akin to our English 'lust,' which means strong desire and eager intention.

The problem is a problem of correspondence. This was what St. Peter brought out so strongly in his Pentecostal sermons. 'The Holy Ghost,' which he hath given to them that obey him,' implies at the same time that if the hearers were to repent and believe and obey, as other people had done, then they also would receive the same baptism and obtain the same blessing. We must abandon, therefore, the idea that the Holy Spirit is something arbitrary in experience. It was no arbitrary visitation which came on John the Baptist in the wilderness: he had been in special training for it. Had there been another man equally disciplined and equally obedient, or more so, that other man might or would have become the Forerunner.

We may state that the baptism of the Holy

Spirit is the gift of God to conditioned souls who are humble, lowly, penitent, and believing; to people who ardently desire God and His love and His will, and who by their acts of consecration and obedience dig channels for the river of God to flow into.

When does the Spirit come? This is something like the question, 'When does the service begin?' to which the answer was, 'When thou dost begin to serve.' Or the question, 'When shall I find my willing heart all taken up by thee?' to which the answer is, 'When it is a willing heart.' If we ask 'When does the Spirit come?' the answer is 'When we can say, "Come, Lord Jesus," out of truly consecrated hearts.'

This is not, indeed, the whole answer. It has pleased God to grant us an objective answer on the plane of human history, in the great day of Pentecost; and, by combining together a number of willing hearts in one great experience, to make us see that His gift has something to do with Christ risen and glorified, and with our own faith in Him as such. Thus one answer to the question, 'When does it list?' is the historical answer, 'When Jesus is glorified.' 'Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received . . . the promise he hath shed forth this.' That is the historical solution; but along with it there is another, according to the rule that nothing happens in the Church universal which has not something analogous to it in our individual experience. The drama of the Crucifixion is repeated in the soul of every saint 'I am crucified with Christ'; and so also is the drama of Pentecost. There must be a day fully come in the soul, as once there was in the Church and the one is, or should be, as definite as the other.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. R. Harris, *As Pants the Hart*, 141.

## Wanted—A Revised Natural Theology.

By PROFESSOR C. J. WRIGHT, B.D., PH.D., DIDSBURY COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.

MODERN religious thought is concerned, to a quite noteworthy degree, with what may be called the 'presuppositions' of theology. Until comparatively recent times theology was regarded not so much as an inquiry as a 'revelation.' The main task of theologians was the erection of an apologetic edifice on foundations regarded as stable and

secure—God, Christ, Immortality. The stability and security of these were ensured by three other foundation stones—the Bible as 'God's Word,' Miracle as evidencing His freedom to intervene in Nature and in History, a 'revealed' eschatology as giving validity and content to the immortal hope. The first *trio* I will call primary presupposi-



ons. The second *trio* I will call secondary presuppositions. The restatement of the former, in view of the modified conceptions of the latter, is the main task confronting theological thought in our time. The development of historical and literary criticism on the one hand, and of the comparative study of religion on the other, has led, and still leads, as will be almost universally recognized, to the modification of the first and third of these secondary presuppositions. The second of the latter trio has in these essentially scientific days to endure a scrutiny begotten of the intensification of scientific inquiry, the accumulation of scientific knowledge, and of the presumptions on which that inquiry and knowledge are based. It is with the questions involved in this latter scrutiny, and chiefly as bearing on the first of our primary presuppositions, that we are chiefly concerned in this paper.

The questions involved here are those chiefly dealt with in the past by what was known as *natural theology*. There is to-day in this country a very healthy concern with the problems presented by this *divine philosophy*, as Bacon used so appropriately and suggestively to designate this study. The era that lies before us—I state at least my own conviction—will see an increasingly general interest in this most fascinating, and most crucial, of all theologico-philosophical studies.

We moderns have in large measure entered into the valuable heritage bequeathed to us by Schleiermacher, 'the father of modern theology,' with his bidingly valuable emphasis on religion as a personal *experience*. This contribution, coming when it did, is to be regarded as an exceedingly opportune corrective to the arid dogmatisms of traditional theology, and will be so regarded except, on the one hand, by traditional supernaturalists and, on the other, by anti-mystic theological rationalists. In an age when the spread of evolutionary views in relation both to the natural universe and to Biblical literature had caused acute instability to the main theological edifice, Schleiermacher's teaching that religion is not to be equated with theology was both valuable (it was of considerable assistance to many in the then 'present distress') and true. With this may be paralleled Ritschl's emphasis, two generations later, on the data of the ethical and spiritual consciousness as the basis and inspiration of theology.

These lessons having, however, been learnt, a new situation presents itself to-day, and those who in our times are inclined to rest all on the objective validity of religious experience will, I imagine,

come to discover that as far as the problems of the age are concerned they have been born a generation too late. In other words, religion cannot do without a theology, and theology must have some kind of metaphysical foundation. The ethical and spiritual data given in experience are not to be sundered from an enlightened natural theology and from the presuppositions on which such a theology is based.

This will become evident if we remember that theology can never be content to have its sphere restricted to one portion of reality. Thus, a theology of experience must take its harmonious place in a more comprehensive theology which has a place for a theology of Nature. Thought cannot rest with fragmentary and isolated portions of knowledge. These must be unified, or thought itself will perish of an agnostic *malaise*. Hegel stated this from his own metaphysical point of view when, in his *Lectures on the Proofs of the Existence of God*, he said that a contradiction of faith by thought is the most painful of all divisions in the depths of the Spirit. Theology may yet again, in an age perhaps far distant, come to be recognized as 'the Queen of the sciences'; but this recognition can only come in so far as she is able to justify her claim to unify and harmonize both the facts which are given by the several sciences and the presuppositions on which these sciences rest. What, therefore, I am here contending for is that we cannot leave the consideration of theistic presuppositions as a kind of *addendum* to be placed at the end of a theological presentation centred wholly on history and experience. And with the progressive democratization of enlightenment, the necessity of a rational basis for the great religious affirmations will be more and more keenly perceived and felt. Even in our own island, where, at least south of the Tweed, the national genius is practical rather than metaphysical, there are signs that inquiry into fundamentals is growing; and that our national distrust of thought is coming to distrust itself.

The task of the future is the construction of a theological system in which the various parts have interior coherence and harmonious concatenation. Aquinas achieved this for his age. A greater than Aquinas is necessary for such a task in this and the coming age; for of the two presuppositions on which he built, one has already gone, and the other is now in the melting-pot. And here I confess myself unable, without reservations, to follow Professor Whitehead in his thesis that 'the faith in the possibility of science, generated antecedently to the development of modern scientific theory, is an unconscious derivative from medieval theology,'

and that the scientific faith in rationality is 'the greatest contribution of medievalism to the formation of the scientific movement.'<sup>1</sup> As far as I am able to understand medieval theology, one of its central and dominating presumptions was the duality of natural and supernatural, and that, not in the sense that the supernatural is interpretative of the natural, but in the sense that the supernatural is scientifically or descriptively such. And I am unable to understand how this dualism of phenomenal events can be a contribution to that scientific faith which Professor Whitehead so well defines as 'the inexpugnable belief that every detailed occurrence can be correlated with its antecedents in a perfectly definite manner, exemplifying general principles.' With this reservation, however, I can conceive no more important and necessary task for future religious thinking than the construction of a coherent system of theological thought having for its foundation a natural theology in which the scientific principle of rationality is neither set aside nor evaded.

Lacking, therefore, a conception of 'revelation' which was authoritative by virtue of its 'supernatural' *mode*, and a conception of the miraculous which was 'evidential' for the same reason, we are led to consider the main and essential principle on which a revised natural theology can be based. That principle is that the human mind is so constituted that it may, by thinking rightly of all the facts of Nature, reach a belief in the being and nature of God. Those who are unable to accept this principle will doubtless reply that such a constitution of the human mind is itself a faith, a presupposition, and requires to be proved. To such an objection the only answer is that proof in a strictly logical sense is impossible here: an infinite and transcendent hypothesis, God, cannot be reached logically from finite and immanent facts of experience. The *rapprochement* which natural theology presupposes between the human mind and God, itself presupposes the being of God; and the being of God is not to be 'proved,' it is a necessary assumption on which rests the coherence and rationality of the universe. We do not prove God from phenomena; He is the necessary presupposition of those who would attribute any ultimate significance to Truth, and any Meaning to the universe. We may not, therefore, as I hold, be forbidden to maintain the essential principle of natural theology on the ground that it cannot be proved. In reasoning, at least of any ultimate character, we must begin somewhere. And, per-

sonally, I would rather begin with a principle which enables me to think *with faith* than with complete agnosticism which can give no reason for its own thinking. Further, the acceptance of the principle on which natural theology rests does not involve that the *content* of this belief in the being of God is thereby secured. Inquiry has then to be pursued, having then been made possible. The possibility of a natural theology, therefore, rests on two foundation stones (which are in reality inseparable): first, the negation of a final agnosticism; and second, the existence of a Ground of a reality, God.

When we seek to *fill in* this necessary Ground of reality with a *content* we must, it is clear, do two things: first, we must look within; and second we must look without. In looking within we are led to concern ourselves with *moral* considerations and with what I will call mystical or religious considerations. It is in looking without that we are led to do justice in our scheme to the facts of Nature and to concern ourselves with that 'divine philosophy' or 'natural theology' which Bacon defined as 'that knowledge or *scintilla* of knowledge concerning God, which may be obtained by the contemplation of created things; which knowledge (he went on to add) may be truly termed divine, in respect of the object, and natural in respect of the light.' This knowledge, he went on further to add, 'sufficeth to convince atheism.'<sup>2</sup>

In point of fact, the orderly sequences of Nature have inspired in most minds, in their moments at least, when, liberated from engrossment with the *minutiae* of scientific observation, they have been able to think of the *whole* which confronts the human mind, the conviction that behind all there is Mind, and if Mind, then Purpose. We may indeed, become so engrossed in the necessary task of seeking the scientific reason *for things* as to become oblivious for the time of the deeper necessity of discerning the ultimate reason *behind things*. Yet to most there come moments of insight when an assurance, preeminent and finally inescapable is born that there is meaning in and behind all this. I give the following illustrations, which may serve at least to show how widespread has been this insight, and on the part of minds of considerable congenial diversity.

'The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork,' said the Psalmist. 'The invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his ever-

<sup>1</sup> *Science and the Modern World*, pp. 17-18.

<sup>2</sup> *De Aug. Scient.*, lib. III. cap. ii.



asting power and divinity,' said Paul. 'What can be so plain and evident,' said Cicero, in the person of Lucilius Balbus, 'when we behold the heavens, and contemplate the celestial bodies, as the existence of some supreme, divine intelligence by which we are governed?' 'Can I but wonder here,' he went on to add, 'that any one can persuade himself that certain solid and individual bodies move by their natural force and gravitation, and that a world so beautifully adorned was made by their fortuitous concourse? He who believes this possible may as well believe that if a great quantity of the one-and-twenty letters, composed either of gold or any other matter, were thrown upon the ground, they would fall into such order as legibly to form the annals of Ennius. . . . Is he worthy to be called a man who attributes to chance, not to an intelligent cause, the constant motions of the heavens, the regular courses of the stars, the agreeable proportion and connection of all things, conducted with so much reason, that our reason itself is lost in the inquiry?'<sup>1</sup> 'There are two books from whence I collect my divinity,' said Sir Thomas Browne in *Religio Medici*, 'beside the written one of God, another of His servant Nature, that universal and public manuscript that lies expans'd unto the eyes of all.' Hume began *The Natural History of Religion* with this affirmation: 'The whole frame of nature bespeaks an intelligent author; and no rational inquirer can, after serious reflection, suspend his belief a moment with regard to the primary principles of genuine Theism and Religion.' And in his concluding General Corollary he makes an unambiguous re-affirmation: 'Though the stupidity of men, barbarous and uninstructed, be so great that they may not see a sovereign author in the more obvious works of nature, to which they are so much familiarized; yet it scarcely seems possible that any one of good understanding should reject that idea, when once it is suggested to him. A purpose, an intention, a design, is evident in everything; and when our comprehension is so far enlarged as to contemplate the first rise of this visible system, we must adopt, with the strongest conviction, the idea of some intelligent cause or author.' In the *Life of Darwin*, by his son, we are told of some words spoken by him in the last years of his life to the then Duke of Argyll. The latter had said, with reference to some of Darwin's remarkable scientific work on the Fertilization of Orchids and cognate observations in Nature, that it was impossible to look at these without seeing that they were the effect or expression of

mind. Darwin looked at the Duke of Argyll very hard, and said: 'Well, that often comes over me with overwhelming force; but at other times,' and he shook his head vaguely, 'it seems to go away.'<sup>2</sup> Most scientific workers are acquainted with this 'it seems to go away'; the limitations of the human mind being what they are, it is not easy to be at one and the same time both intense scientific observer and comprehensive philosophic thinker. Yet with the furthest conceivable advance in scientific inquiry, the same ultimate questions will remain, and the same final conviction of Purpose will reward, as we dare to believe, man's deepest insight. Herbert Spencer, in his *Reflections*, at the age of seventy-three, with which he concluded his *Autobiography*, said: 'Among men of science there are those who curiously examining the spectra of nebulae, or calculating the masses and motions of double-stars, never pause to contemplate under other than physical aspects the immeasurably vast facts they record. But in both cultured and uncultured there occur lucid intervals. . . . By those who know much, more than by those who know little, is there felt the need for explanation.'<sup>3</sup> Sir J. H. Jeans, at the close of his monumental work, *Astronomy and Cosmogony*, in which he confines himself to seeking to create a 'living cinematograph film which will exhibit the universe growing, developing, and decaying before our eyes,' in which he vividly depicts the universe as 'a mass of matter slowly but inexorably dissolving away into intangible radiation,' confesses that the completion of his task leads but to the beginning of the real question—what is the significance of the vast processes portrayed. And surely, we may add, the very fact of the human mind and spirit, thus compelled by its very nature to inquire for this significance, must be itself a clue to this meaning. In 'The Mysterious Universe' there is Jeans himself.

There is, therefore, a sense in which the Roman Church emphasis on the 'natural light of the human reason' as leading to God is to be welcomed, it being taken for granted that we seek to understand, not to anathematize, the holders of contrary views. 'If any one says that the natural light of the human reason is incapable of making certainly known, by means of created things, the one and true God, our Creator and Master, let him be anathema.' This Vatican decree was quoted, as will be familiar to students of the subject, by Pius x. in his Encyclical *Pascendi* against the 'Modernists' whom he condemned. We are permitted, however,

<sup>1</sup> *De Natura Deorum*.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. i. p. 316.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. ii. p. 469.

to doubt whether Authority understood the position of at least all those it condemned. The anti-intellectualism anathematized by *Pascendi* did not fear that the human reason would, if unfettered, lead to a *belief* in God: what it did maintain was that this *belief* in God was not, in and by itself, the goal of the religious quest. That goal, indeed, is nothing less than a *knowledge* of God, a spiritual awareness more immediate than a belief, more peremptory than an inference. To negate the immediacy of this knowledge in the interests of apologetic—for which curious situation it is not impossible to find illustrations—is to defend religion in a way to make religion impossible. Nevertheless, those who are unable to assent, whether to a complete traditionalism to which External Authority takes the place of personal Experience, or to an anti-mystic theological rationalism, do not deny—indeed they should, as we hold, emphatically affirm—that *as far as the conditions of the case will permit* the theistic inference is justified. While we may no longer speak of *proofs* of the existence of God, we may confidently declare both that the human reason will lead to God and that ‘created things’ reveal the mode of His activity. The idea of God, as Lotze put it, is ‘the indispensable presupposition of all intelligibility in finite things.’

If there is such a thing as natural theology, if, in other words, the presuppositions on which this study rests are sound, it follows that the more we know about the natural universe environing us, the more we shall know of the ways of God. The theologian, therefore, so far from being either resentful of, or unconcerned with, the investigations of science, has a quite primary interest in such investigations. Those who believe in natural theology must believe intensely in science, and the test of the sincerity of that belief is discovered to us by our hopes and by our fears. True faith welcomes *ex animo* every advance of science which pushes back the frontiers of our ignorance. The only reason why believing theologians cannot always give themselves to scientific exploration is because, the human mind being what it is, they have not, in days when knowledge is increasing out of all proportion to the capacity of any ordinary mind to assimilate it, the requisite mental energy left over after their other mental toils. Nevertheless to the theologian the assured findings of science are data for his thought. As much as Feuerbach he differs ‘*toto celo*’ from those philosophers who pluck out their eyes that they may see better. He has as little sympathy as the scientist with a dialectic which divorces itself from history

and experience. Thought is given us to engage, not with itself, but with the universe which environs us, and the scientific proclamation of what a recent French writer (Félix Sartiaux) calls ‘la souveraineté de l’expérience contre la stérilité de la pure dialectique’ is also a theological proclamation. A theology that has had any life-blood in it has always sought its foundation in history and experience, and *on this rests our faith and our hope for the final rapprochement of theology and science.* The theological edifice, as much as the scientific edifice, has to be built upon facts; and while there may well be discussion as to what precisely *are* the facts, this common standpoint and concern must make in the end for mutual understanding.

The facts of science, therefore, as much as the facts of the religious and moral consciousness, afford the stones with which it is the theologian’s task to construct the edifice of his world-view. When he has time and opportunity for scientific observations he will always feel, as Kepler felt in the course of his astronomical observations, that *he is thinking God’s thoughts after Him.* Uneasiness in the presence of the observations of science or a mid-nineteenth century hostility, reveals the absence, and not the presence, of belief in God. In each case a theistic protestation is the cloak of a theistic scepticism. Those who believe in God as the Transcendent Ground and as the Immanent Reason of the universe must perforce be whole-hearted in their zeal to discover in Nature the mode by which He works. To them, if I may quote the words of Professor Pringle-Pattison, ‘the progressiverationalization of the world by science is a continuous extension of our knowledge of God.’

The outstanding fact of this whole situation is that the *results* of this scientific inquiry verify the *faith* which inspires it. Inductive investigation joins hands with intuitive presupposition. Scientific experience has, in other words, fortified scientific belief in *Law*. The universe has, once again, not deceived us in our intuitive conviction. From a million facts has come the *Yea*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I have not the requisite scientific knowledge to discuss profitably the Quantum theory, with its seeming ‘indeterminacy.’ With all humility, it seems to me that to talk of the indeterminacy of electrons is like a savage talking of the indeterminacy of an eclipse. The following words of Einstein, quoted by Professor Eddington in *The Nature of the Physical World*, seem to me to set forth the important point: ‘It is only in the quantum theory that Newton’s differential method becomes inadequate, and indeed strict causality fails us. *But the last word has not yet been said. May the spirit of Newton’s method give us the power to restore*



The abiding difficulty for the theistic philosopher is to achieve an intelligible conception of God in His relation to the world. This difficulty belongs both to what I may call a traditionalist theism, which discovered His transcendence in the interruptions in a Nature that otherwise revealed His immanent presence; and to a modernist theism which refuses to rest that transcendence on interruptions which are incapable of being demonstrated. Let it always be remembered that 'gaps' may not be gaps in Nature, but gaps in our knowledge of Nature. To my own mind there is no greater difficulty in the belief that God can achieve His purposes through what is sometimes called the 'mechanism of Nature,' than in the belief that His inability so to do is made good now and again by specific 'interferences.' The difference between the two types of theistic belief lies here—that the former secures the transcendence of God by the complicate of moral and religious faith, the latter by the repudiation of the faith of science in descriptive continuity. To my own mind the former theistic belief is both more coherent with a spiritual or value philosophy of the universe, and with the scientific assumption of a Nature which exhibits orderly sequences—an assumption or a faith, further, which has been, and is, justified by results.

My own understanding of this difficult and contentious issue leads me to suggest that a revived and revised natural theology will not require gaps or discontinuities in historical or scientific concatenation to eke out the inadequacies of its 'proof.'

Such a theology will require, however, the data of man's highest moral and spiritual insight—and this in order to *supplement* it and give it moral and spiritual content. Theistic faith is at bottom a faith in the eternal significance of the moral and spiritual universe. Nature is the body of the spiritual. The world is a 'vale of soul-making.' It is not, nor can it ever seem to be except to those who are deceived by the fond shadows of earthly things, a meadow for body-making. Such a faith, emancipated and emancipating, does not ask to be delivered from 'inexorable nature'; nor will it refuse to face the facts of such inexorability. It does not *rebel* against the facts; it *accepts* them.

Streams will not curb their pride,

The just man not to entomb,

Nor lightnings go aside

To give his virtues room.

union between physical reality and the profoundest characteristic of Newton's teaching—strict causality.' (See *Nature*, March 26, 1927, italics ours.)

The acceptance of this lesson will extirpate from the mind false notions of material blessedness, of physical and temporal prosperity, and will lead to that ethical and spiritual understanding that *all things* work together for good to those who love God. To the theologian it will come as the reminder that one of the supreme tasks of modern theology is the extirpation from the body of religious thought of the many anomalous materialistic factors disguised so effectively as spiritual and moral necessities that they deceive all but the elect.

It is not necessary in the interests of a faith which is fundamentally ethical and spiritual to deny that God may have set bounds for Himself which He Himself will not cross: there is no greater difficulty in the idea that He limits Himself by what we call Nature than by the hierarchy of sentient and intelligent creatures. Nor is it necessary in the interests of faith in a God who has concern for the individual to believe that virtue can commandeer immunity from Nature's catastrophic sequences and that vice ensures a temporal and materialistic retribution: that His sun rises on the just and on the unjust is no 'proof' of His special act for the former or of His indifferentism to moral and spiritual ends. The essential constituent of every not too unworthy conception of God is this, that He has so constituted the conditions of our probationary existence in the world that 'all things' can work together for our spiritual good, that from the temporal we can seize the eternal, that from the fleeting phantasmagoria of things we can make that wherewith to build the house not made with hands eternal in the heavens.

It is in this necessary *supplement* to natural theology that a *Christian* theology will have its full and desirable scope. In that life which for the Christian incarnates the Love that is God, in that life whose ethical insight and ethical power sprang, as we believe, from an awareness of God, a union with God, not paralleled in any other human, the Christian thinker finds 'the chief cornerstone' of his philosophical and theological edifice.

The revived natural theology desiderated, therefore, will not be the unequally yoked partner of a 'supernatural' theology, to be discarded when the convenience of the latter requires; it will be the partner of an ethical and spiritual theology, to which one of its main services will be the purification from materialistic, or unscientific, accretions.



## Contributions and Comments.

### 'Good Master' (Mk. x. 17).

Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ.

A DIFFICULTY arises here from the circumstance that the adjective in Greek for 'good' follows the noun, instead of preceding it, as is usually the case. Generally Christ was addressed simply as Master, or Teacher. In Mt 19<sup>16</sup> the best MSS omit the adjective. The question at issue is not that of the character of Jesus, but the nature of the good thing, that has to be done to enter or possess the Kingdom of God, or the life eternal, and this is emphasized clearly in Matthew here. In the situation presented the earnest inquirer, who had heard Jesus speaking about the necessary condition of the blessed life, or the good, asked about it. The Greek word ἀγαθόν was sometimes written ἀγαθ', and this might very easily have been read as ἀγαθέ, and so made an adjective qualifying the word for Teacher, as showing with what respect the young ruler addressed Jesus. This was, however, needless, as Teacher was sufficient for this purpose. The use of good here is surely not 'pointless.' It was a natural question to ask, as we see in Matthew.

In reply, Jesus asked, Why do you speak to me about the good? In what sense do you use the

word. God, you know, is good, and what E requires in the Torah, which you possess, is the good, which you have to carry out with full purpose and a loving heart. The inquirer, with many others then among the Pharisees, had erred in thinking that God simply required a legal and complete external obedience, while Jesus continually taught that 'the good' was not this, but essentially an inward and spiritual surrender of heart and mind to God, even as this was the first and greatest commandment. 'Thou shalt love the LORD thy God.' The 'good' to be done, the *summum bonum* to be possessed was just love to God.

We must surely refuse to accept the view that Matthew was correcting Mark for doctrinal reasons. Was he not really giving the traditional report of the same incident, to which Mark refers? And may we not be justified in thinking that Matthew supplies a tradition more in harmony with the actual facts of the case?

When we reach this conclusion we see how irrelevant to the facts has been all the discussion which has sought to find some disclaimer of goodness on the part of Jesus, or the sense in which goodness was applied to the Master by the inquirer.

BUCHANAN BLAKE.

Glasgow.

## Entre Nous.

### Spanish Mystical Poems.

Professor E. Allison Peers has translated into verse the Spiritual Canticle of the Spanish mystic, St. John of the Cross, and it has been published by the S.P.C.K. He has added to this a translation of some religious sonnets and lyrics by Spanish poets. The title of the small book is *Songs of the Lover and the Beloved*. Those who do not know Professor Peers' 'Studies of the Spanish Mystics' will find this little sixpenny volume an excellent introduction. We quote two of the poems, the first by Pedro Malón de Chaide, representing the golden age of Spanish mysticism, and the second, the work of the Catalan priest, Jacinto Verdaguer, which is typical of modern Spanish devotion.

### THE DIVINE PATIENCE.

O patience, that dost wait eternally!  
O heart of mine so hard, that cannot love!  
How am I wearied as from Thee I rove!  
How dost Thou, never wearying, pardon me!

O Face Divine, how often do I see  
Thy grieving eyes toward me sadly turn'd,  
While I, my Lord, Thy laws have basely spurn'd,  
And Thou hast lov'd and suffer'd silently!

Guardian of all men, turn Thy wrath away  
From this Thy child of earth, oh turn again!  
See, Thine own child am I: raise me, I pray,  
For 'tis not pleasure now that makes me stray  
But habits fought and striv'n against in vain:  
I hate the sin, and yet I sin away.



Lord, Thou deceivest me !  
 A slave, I was to be :  
 Thou gav'st me liberty.  
 Lord, Thou deceivest me !  
 Thy cross I bow'd to kiss :  
 Thou gav'st me—what is this ?—  
*The first-fruits of Thy bliss.*

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Hymn Writer.

#### LORD OF ALL BEING.

Lord of all being ! throned afar,  
 Thy glory flames from sun and star ;  
 Centre and soul of every sphere,  
 Yet to each loving heart how near !  
 Sun of our life, thy quickening ray  
 Sheds on our path the glow of day ;  
 Star of our hope, thy softened light  
 Cheers the long watches of the night.

Our midnight is thy smile withdrawn ;  
 Our noontide is thy gracious dawn ;  
 Our rainbow arch thy mercy's sign ;  
 All, save the clouds of sin, are thine !

Lord of all life, below, above,  
 Whose light is truth, whose warmth is love,  
 Before thy ever-blazing throne  
 We ask no lustre of our own.

Grant us thy truth to make us free,  
 And kindling hearts that burn for thee ;  
 Till all thy living altars claim  
 One holy light, one heavenly flame.

It was by his hymns rather than by 'The Professor at the Breakfast Table' that Oliver Wendell Holmes wanted to be remembered. He wrote in 1876 to Mr. James William Kimball, 'It would be one of the most agreeable reflections to me, if I could feel that I had left a few worthy hymns to be remembered after me.'

Probably the best hymn he has left is the one quoted above. A fresh and useful study of it has been written by the Rev. J. Sherman Potter for a book published by the Abingdon Press and edited by the Rev. Stanley Armstrong Hunter—*The Music of the Gospel* (\$2.50).

'The first note of the hymn is God the Father. The Lord, sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, before whose awful majesty "the foundations of the threshold shook," surrounded with seraphim chanting, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts ; the whole earth is full of his glory"—this macro-cosmic vision of Isaiah, magnificent as it is, is not the vision of this hymn. God is not so unapproach-

able. He does not hold Himself aloof, but is concerned with the microcosm, and reveals His glory tenderly and with solicitude to every human heart.'

In 1871 Holmes wrote in a letter to an old school-mate : 'It is trust in something better and wiser than we are. . . . To this, in one shape or another, we must all come. If we have a Father, He will care for us and do what is best for us ; and if He is as good as even our earthly fathers and mothers have been, will judge us not by our poor stumbling acts and short-sighted views and pitiable shortcomings, but in the light of His own magnanimous, forgiving, loving nature. . . . We must all soon cast anchor, if we have one, and mine is Trust in God.'

And trust in God is the second note stressed by Oliver Wendell Holmes in this hymn which was written at such a critical time in his nation's history—the eve of the Civil War.

Mr. Potter says : 'It was during Holmes' career as a professor that the full clash of the religious-scientific ruction swept the Anglo-Saxon world. . . . In an admirable paragraph, quoted from an address to Harvard students in 1861, Holmes thus spoke : "To fear science or knowledge lest it disturb our old beliefs is to fear the influx of the Divine Wisdom into the souls of our fellow-men ; for what is science but the piecemeal revelation—uncovering—of the plan of creation, by the agency of those chosen prophets of nature whom God has illuminated from the central light of truth for that single purpose ?"'

So in this hymn we have an apostrophe to the Lord of all being. We have the revelation that He makes to hearts of His loving-kindness. 'The trustfulness of the poet in God's guidance follows in the second and third stanzas. And last, we have the prayer that God's truth shall illumine life, that all living altars shall burn for Him.'

#### Copying Christ.

What are the essential characteristics of a good children's sermon ? Mary Kirkpatrick Berg in her Foreword to *Magic Music* says that there are three. It must get the children's undivided attention from the start. It must be suited to the children who are listening to it even if they are of mixed ages. And it must have religious value.

There are six volumes of sermons in front of us just now and they all pass this test. The Student Christian Movement publish two of the volumes—*Magic Music* (3s. 6d. net) and *Sermons without Words*, by the Rev. J. C. Carlile, C.H., D.D. (2s. 6d. net). *A Quiver of Arrows*, by the Rev. John Kennedy, B.D. (3s. 6d. net), and *Three*



*Wonderful Keys*, by Mr. J. Ernest Parsons (3s. 6d. net), are from Messrs. Allenson. *Idols or Lamp-stands*, by the Rev. P. Austin, B.A. (2s. 6d. net), and *Tell the Children* (3s. 6d. net) are from the Kingsgate Press. We take an example from the last volume. It contains twenty-six addresses to boys and girls, selected by Mr. M. E. Aubrey, each written by a different hand. Here is the one by the Rev. P. T. Thomson in shortened form :

‘COPYING CHRIST.

‘“Copy me as I copy Christ.”—1 Co 11<sup>1</sup> (Moffatt).

‘As I walked one day in a street in the heart of London, I heard a child crying as if its heart would break. It made me wish to get out of the sound of it as quickly as possible. I hurried on, but the clamour only seemed to get worse. Then it occurred to me that it was rather cowardly to run away from a child in distress. So I retraced my steps to the house. One of those tall tenement houses—one, two, three, four storeys, and a basement with window letting on to a small area, railed in at the level of the pavement. I peered down into the twilight of the room below-stairs, for it was evident that there was the scene of all this heart-rending hullabaloo. There, sure enough, I discovered the cause.

‘It was a PARROT.

‘Yes, a parrot, imitating a crying child to such perfection that the child’s own mother would have been deceived.

‘My first feeling was one of distinct annoyance. Here had I been expending my sympathy to no purpose. But as I walked away, and the dudgeon died down, I seemed to hear the parrot chiding me. “All very well for you,” it said, “to be cross because I give a rendering of something unpleasant, but how often have you done the same?” And from that the parrot seemed to go on to preach a sermon with two heads.

‘1. *Never copy what should not be copied.*

‘The parrot had heard the boy in merry mood—laughing, singing, or whistling. Had it but used its wonderful powers of mimicry to echo the laughter and the merriment, it would have made a bit of London brighter that morning. As it was, the parrot brought cloud and sad thoughts into the street by copying what is better not copied. Following a bad example means making the world greyer for everybody.

‘2. *Never give an example you wouldn’t wish to be copied.*

‘I thought of the boy who had given the parrot the bad example—a grown man now, perhaps,

but his temper and petulance still echoing in the heart of London. You never know when others are going to see or hear the last of any bad example you set. For there is always a parrot listening. A small brother or sister or chum; they have a knack of imitation as wonderful as any parrot’s. They find it the easiest thing in the world to say the things you say, and to do the things you do. And as they copy you, some others are going to copy them. One never knows where or when the effect of example is going to crop up.

‘Such was the parrot’s sermon. And the text? I had to find that for myself, and the words of Paul seemed to fit: “Copy me as I copy Christ.” Paul was writing to people who knew very little about the Christian life. They had habits and ways which were not at all becoming in those who wished to be followers of Christ. So he said to them, “I am far from being all I ought to be, but at least I am doing my best to copy my Master, so from my conduct you can get some idea of what it is to be a Christian.”

Jesus was the model Paul had set out to copy, much as you do, when you sit down with pencil and paper to copy a vase or some other subject in your drawing class. You know how hard it is to get it exactly to your mind. It was just like that with Paul. He looked, and looked, and studied so very hard the outline of the altogether lovely model he had set in front of him. He drew it not on paper, but on his mind, his soul, his character. He had to use the india-rubber pretty often. “No, Paul,” he would say to himself, “that was not like Jesus! You mustn’t do that again.” But he persevered with his drawing, till one day it came to him with a thrill that he had got somewhere near it, and he cried, “I live, yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me.” That is to say, the outline of Christ’s beautiful character had taken shape in his own, till he hardly knew which was Paul and which was Paul’s Master. That is how he dared to say, “Copy me as I copy Christ.”

‘If Christ is my model, then I shall carry out the things the parrot said to me. For I shall copy what is worth copying, and so make life safe and happy for myself, and I shall give an example that is worth copying, and so make life safe and happy for other people.’

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.